Tradidi Vobis

OR THE

Traditionary Conveyance

OF

FAITH

Cleer'd,

In the RATIONAL WAY,

Againſt

The Exceptions of a Learned Opponent.

By *J. B.* Eſquire.

---

1 COR. II. 2.

Laudo autem vos fratres, quòd — ſicut Tradidi vobis, *præcepta mea tenetis.*

LONDON,
Printed in the Year, 1662.

43
4. 6
87.

The PUBLISHER to the Reader.

IF I treſpaſs againſt Civility in publiſhing this Controverſie, *without the Authors conſents, I preſume them as much righted in my good opinion of them, which chiefly emboldened me to this attempt; for I looked upon them both as hearty lovers of truth, and aymers both at the ſame fair mark, though their ſhafts were ſhot from oppoſite Camps; and hence concluded a diſpoſition in them to ſubmit any private conſideration to that moſt prevalent concern, and to expoſe their candid thoughts to the open day, however the* Genius *of modeſty bluſhes to be made its own diſcoverer, and rather permits it ſelf to be gueſſed at by others, affecting to leave, not without ſome unnatu-*

ralneſs, its hopeful productions to be foſtered up and cheriſhed by the care of providence, or the charitable pitie of ſome accidental Paſſenger.

This Character I have of the worthy and learned Author of theſe Objections, *from acquaintance, and his own ſober Pen; and the ſame I dare avow of my Friend the* Replyer. *And that as the former intended only his own private ſatisfaction; ſo the later had no further end in his eye, than to ſatisfie ſo candid an Enquirers particular ſcruples, or perhaps a grateful reſpect to that incomparable and much envied Maſter of his, the great* Explainer *of* Tradition; *to the defence of whoſe Doctrine he owes the imployment of that ſtrength the ſame Doctrine had given him. Yet, why may I not add, too, as a likely motive of his pains, at any fair hint of occaſion, his high zeal for the ſubject it ſelf,* Tradition; *ſo onelily important, ſo radically influential towards ſteddineſs in faith, That* Ruſhworths Dialogues, *and* the Apology *for them*

can

can never be over-importunely abetted and preſs'd.

Now though I am bound by my Reaſon to hold the victory on my friends ſide, and to expect the Readers ſhould judge the ſame; yet I profeſs ingenuouſly I printed not this out of a conceit that the weak carriage of the Objector gave any advantage or incouragement; but rather impute much to his excellent wit, that uſing a cleer and unblundering expreſſion, (a thing rare in ſuch Adverſaries) could manage ſo well ſo infirm a cauſe; and that having weighed Doctor Hammonds *Diſcourſe againſt* Tradition *with his, I judged this far the more nervous, manly, and worthy my Friends thoughts, then the former; not only becauſe that affects too much wordiſhneſs, and confuſedneſs, but becauſ the death of its Author might make it, with ſom ſhew of reaſon, objected, that it was ignoble to ſeek to triumph over the aſhes of one adverſary, and decline others, yet alive of equal or greater force, entring the liſts upon the ſame quarrel.*

S. W.

ERRATA.

PAge 11. line 15. read inviolate, p. 15. l. ult. r. *there may.* p. 26. l. 6. r. critically evince. and l. 15. r. *comes now.* p. 19. l. 4. r. *of your.* p. 21. l. 6. r. *they not understanding, his craft will*--- and l. 14. r. *which all.* p. 28. l. 13. *for* made, r. *incident.* p. 41. l. 21. for *their*, r. *your.* p. 52. l. 20. for *that*, r. *your.* p. 61. l. 18. r. *her.* p. 73. l. 7. r. *in it.* p. 74. l. 12. r. *as* in. p. 80. l. 7, 8. r. *gingling*, and l. 14. for *one*, r. *an.* p. 81. l. 19. r. *notion.* p. 88. l. 6. r. *news.* p. 96. l. 20. r. *to another.* p. 99. l. 8. r. there *are.* p. 114. l. 15. r. *confirmandos.* p. 119. l. 7. r. *deference.* p. 122. l. 22. r. de et p. 123 l. 20. r. derive *their.* p. 125. l. 20. r. *Books, is.* p. 142. l. 5. r. *could not*, not. p. 164. l. 14. dele *yet.* p. 176. l. 18. r. *evince them.* p. 181. l. 7, 8. r. has provided *even against the defects of* nature. p. 182. l. 27. r by *design.* p. 188. l. 12. r. *I see.* p. 192. dele *and.* l. 26. r. *another, and spread among the vulgar upon the authority of private men, as Doctors, are*--- p. 197. l. 6. r. *descent.* p. 218. l. 27. r. *wonder* at *what you say first*; p. 126. l. 21. *before* it be *consecrated* pr. 227. l. 22. r. into it. p. 232. l. 6. r. *furem.* p. 241. l. 4. r *they, not yet* being *admitted.* p. 246. l. 21. r. *non-admission*; 'tis *false.* p. 252. l. ult. r. do *not.* p. 265. l. 18. r. *reverenc'd* and l. 25. for *prays* r. pray-rs. p. 270. l. 27. r. *places.* p. 271. l. 15. r. hold *true.* p. 283. l. 7. r. is evidenc'd. p. 293. l. 19. r. if *any.* p. 279, l. 26. r. *upon.* p. 287. l. 14. r. *'twould have.*

CONTENTS.

PART I.

Scripture not the Rule of Faith.

Incertaintie of the Letter of Scripture, in order to that effect. Sect. 1. pag. 1.
Incertainty of the ſenſe of Scripture from the bare Letter. Sect. 2. p. 23.
Scripture, critically managed, not ſufficient to decide Controverſies. Sect. 3. p. 45.
The two Places, Iohn 20. *and* Luke 1. *no proof that the written Word is a ſufficient means for the ſalvation of mankind.* Sect. 4. p. 86.
Anſwer to thoſe Fathers, who are brought for the ſufficiency of Scripture. Sect. 5 p. 109.

PART II.

Tradition the Rule of Faith.

Certainty of Tradition, Sect. 1. p. 160.

The Contents.

Authority of Fathers. Transubstantiation. Sect. 2. p. 205.
Prayer to Saints. Sect. 3. p. 238.
Images, Sect. 4. p. 274.
The Conclusion. Sect. 5. p. 285.

PART

PART I.

SCRIPTURE not the Rule of FAITH.

SECT. I.

Incertainty of the Letter of Scripture in Order to that Effect.

SIR,

I Have often bemoaned my loss of your ingenuous society, and think my self unhappy that my hopes are gon, of having those verbal conferences, in which I much delighted, and for which I am exceedingly obliged unto you for many civilities; that which I have learnt from you hath put me upon further enquiries then ever I should (as I believ) had you not been the occasion of them, my resolution still remains to proceed by all possible means to make up my present deficiency: If I know any thing of my self, I am an impartial lover of truth, therefore ready to embrace any I am capable of that concerns me to know. I have perused those two Pieces of Mr. Whites with diligence, to find that Demonstration

promiſed, but ſtil remain in my firſt wonder, that ſo many excellent able men ſhould imbrace that for clear truth which to me is falſhood, I think I have not willingly ſhut my eyes againſt light, but opened them both, to ſee what I cannot diſcern; and leſt I ſhould bethought to ſtifle truth, and ſmother conviction in my breaſt, I have here endeavoured to give you a brief account of my apprehenſions of the Diſcourſe, in hope of that candid anſwer and ſatisfaction your ingennity hath been pleaſed to promiſe me. I remember a wiſe ſaying of yours, If this one thing (upon which all depends) the nature of Tradition were well lookt into, many Volumes might be ſaved; ſurely truth may be cleared with few Arguments, which is often inviſible in a croud of words. Mr. White *excellently well reſolves, only to meddle with Arguments, and not to confute Authors in all Punctilioes, becauſe of loſs of time to no purpoſe. I wiſh you were but as willing to urge any one of your ſtrongeſt Arguments (which might be don in a little Paper) as I am deſirous to follow you in the purſuit, I ſhould then hope of benefit, which your ingennity will not altogether ſuffer me to deſpair of, you having yet (as*

I

I remember your words) never refused to dispute with any man.

¶. 2. *Though there be many things in the* First Dialogue *which I do not consent to, yet I think it in vain to mention them, till we be agreed on the* second *and* third, *in which the main point lies on which they depend.*

¶. 3. *In the* Second Dialogue *he proves* Scripture *alone cannot decide Controversies in Religion, because of uncertainty of Copies, Translations,* &c. 1. *I grant we cannot fully determine all things we might desire to know by what we have in Scripture, neither do I think it was intended to make us omniscient.* 2. *We might possibly have known more then we doe, were it not for those several causes of uncertainty mentioned.*

Part I. Sect. 1.

¶ 1, 2, 3.

SIR,

WHere I find so much civility, I expect to feel far stronger Arguments, than if Passion were the manager

of your cauſe, and even your courteſie alone had hazarded to conquer me, had the concern of my cauſe, and the evident truth on my ſide left me to my good nature; But theſe engage me to uſe the beſt weapons my reaſon and knowledg affords, with rigor too againſt the point you maintain, and to exchange thoſe perſonal complements into the ſolider reſpects of heartily endeavouring your ſatisfaction; aſſuring you unfainedly that I more willingly attempt it, becauſe your beſt advantage, the ſight of Truth, (which not only your ſincere expreſſions, but your temper & *genius* manifeſt to be your aim) is included in my victory; who your Friend is with whom you had thoſe verbal Conferences, I am not ſo happy as to learn, nor yet (which is a great misfortune) your ſelf: But ſince 'tis your ſoul that I ſpeak to, and that I have great acquaintance with it by thoſe expreſſions it hath given of it ſelf in your ingenuous Papers, I can ſecurely own ſo much knowledg of you as to take a right meaſure how to behave my ſelf towards you, that is with candor and civility. What circumſtances may have hinder'd your friends gi-

giving ſatisfaction by his own pen, I know not; But I am ſure, though the importunity of powerful Friends, in the abſence of that excellent Maſter of mine, have even forc't me to this task, yet I may with truth ſay, 'twas your temperate way of writing, your clearneſs, and apprehended ſincerity, which were my chief encouragers: Entring the liſts then with this proteſtation, that you have an hearty ſervant for your Adverſarie, and one who combats you only to make you more my friend, and your own; I addreſs to my Defence, And

¶ 2. 3. Becauſe I know not whether the ſtate of the Queſtion be not miſtaken, I conceive this place very fit to obſerve how it ſtands in the ſecond Dialogue: *viz. We beleeve that by Scripture alone, left without the guard of the Church, nothing, or at leaſt, not ſufficient for the ſalvation of mankind can be ſufficiently proved*; Where the words *mankind* and *ſufficiently* being of ſpecial Energie, ought particularly to be obſerved. What is meant by *ſufficient proof* the 15th *Encounter* of the *Apologie*, *p.* 142. declares to be inavoidable and convincing Demonſtration, beyond any ſhadow of Reply.

¶. 4. *Yet thirdly, notwithstanding all that hath been said, I thinke we have sufficient certainty out of Scripture alone, concerning those things which are absolutely necessary for Salvation, and many things besides only profitable, my Reasons are these.*

¶. 4. You put the contradictory to your Adversary, which you assume to prove fairly, meaning by *Salvation*, the the salvation of mankinde, as I presume you do: But your reasons seem to come short of your intent: For suppose all true which you urge to the tenth Paraph, namely, that the alterations mentioned to be possible (whereof you deny not but that many have hapned, yet) have not all of them actually befallen Scripture. Suppose I say this to be true, what a Chaos is there betwixt that Premise, and your Conclusion, That Faith may with sufficient certainty be proved out of Scripture alone? For though all have not hapned, yet since some have, and you are uncertain precisely where, 'tis manifest you can never be certain, but that they have hapned in whatsoever Text you shall pitch upon to prove any thing by, and consequently you can never be absolutely certain of any;

again,

again, since Demostration implyes a *must be* of the Conclusion, and *must be* evidently excludes *may be* of the opposite, 'tis plain, that to destroy Demonstration, that is, in this case, sufficient certainty, it suffices to prove the opposite may be; so that though it be granted, these alterations have not all hapned, yet while there appears a possibility they may have done so, there appears an impossibility of ever coming to a rigorous certainty by Scripture. But to take particular notice of every Paragraph.

¶ 5. 1. *It seems to me more improbable that nothing of Scripture (as you say) should be contrary to your Faith (supposing it the true) notwithstanding those innumerable alterations of Scripture, then that all those alterations of Scripture (proved Metaphysically only possible) should actually have befell the Scripture.*

¶. 5. 'Tis very strange it should appear improbable to you, but that Scripture and our Faith must needs contradict one another, supposing the one to be Scripture, and the other true, as you do: Must truths needs be opposed to themselves, which have hitherto been esteem'd opposite only to falshood? If you mean by Scripture, the

the alterations of Scripture, as the ſequel makes me imagin, how much wrong do you do the Word? for if Scripture be altered or changed from what it was, then 'tis not what it was, that is, 'tis not Scripture. But of theſe Alterations 'tis not our Tenet, that none of them have been contrary to our Faith (the alterations made by the Tranſlations of the firſt Founders of Proteſtancy having been judged ſo contrary to it, that it occaſioned the prohibition to read the Scriptures in Vulgar Tongues) But only that there is nothing in the Vulgar Edition, according to that ſence, in which the Church underſtands it, which is contrary to her faith. And if you will allow the Church but to know the Faith ſhe is appointed to teach, and know what ſhe means by what ſhe reads, and what a contradiction is, [three Requeſts which cannot well be refuſed her] you muſt make her very ignorant, if you deny her power to diſcern whether there be between what ſhe reads, and what ſhe teaches, any contradiction, or not.

¶ 6. *Suppoſe all theſe alterations ſuppoſed poſsible had actually crept in, might we not ſeek for Scripture in Scripture, ſeeing*

they

they are innumerable even to every line and word (as Mr. White) *and how is it possible, that all those deviations from true Scripture should in nothing contradict truths, for you say there is nothing in Scripture contrary to your faith, therefore surely you cannot think there are so many corruptions; for besides what he himself hath (lest he should prove more then he was willing) many Copies had the same faults; I adde, that the Christians, in the Primitive times, were very careful of the Bible, especially when Copies were made for publike use to be in the Church, there was the greatest diligence possible taken to have the oldest and best, which they might have better ground to discern then we can, who lived nigher the first Age; besides the ancientest Copies, the best being kept by publike care were more secure, and could, yea did remain many hundred yeers (as some there are to this very day) by which the Copies that are afterward copied out, may escape many corruptions of others before them.*

¶. 6. You see then how the first part of this Paraph is answered; for we do not say that our Faith has never been contradicted by these deviations, the num-

ber

ber of which, though we cannot determine, we cannot chuſe but think very great; and, whatever we think of theirs, know, that to our purpoſe 'tis enough they may have hapned, whether actually they have, or have not.

And for the ſecond part of it, concerning the care of the Primitive Chriſtians, as I will not deny what you ſay, to have ſome probability, ſo neither can you deny that probability will not ſerve the turn; and that their care, how great ſoever, exempted them not from being men, and ſubject to the caſualties of humane actions. I ſhall therefore fairly allow them to have been as careful as they could be, and conceive the condition they lived in, left them not a capacity of doing what is neceſſary for their intent. For it being known, the Church was under perſecution 300 years; the experience I have how hard it is in this depreſſion, we our ſelves live in, to preſerve monuments in a condition fit to undergo a ſevere juridical examination, much leſs ſuch a one as the ſalvation of mankind ought depend on; ſuch a one as will not only endure the Teſt of wiſe & honeſt judgments, but muſt

be

be proof againſt all cavils of all ſorts of critical wranglers, makes me ſuſpect your conjectures were not throughly and rigorouſly lookt into. Firſt, I doubt the publike care, you ſuppoſe, and perſecution agree not well together: What ſanctuaries, what places free from ſearch, were there for the publike care to ſecure theſe ſacred Monuments in? What ſafety could there be for their writings, whoſe perſons were in perpetual hazard? neceſſarily they muſt have been intruſted to the fidelity of private men, which, let us for once ſuppoſe, did always remain unviolate, and never betray their truſt to any hope or fear, 'tis hard to imagine it could ſo preſerv them from the innumerable hazards neceſſary to be met with, from ſo many enemies in ſo long a time, as that no alterations ſhould creep into the Text. For, (to bar malice and all wilful faults,) both the devotion of private Chriſtians would require, and publike prudence, the better to preſerve it, would endeavour as great a multiplicity of Copies as might be. Theſe Copies muſt of neceſſity be made in haſt and fear, and what enemies they are to exactneſs, 'tis need-

needleſs to inſiſt on. Now in after times what ſhall hinder theſe Copies from conteſting with their Originals in Authority, and if, (which the influence of chance muſt ſometimes needs bring to paſs) the Originals come to be loſt, and the Copies remain, what reaſon ſhall prefer one before another? As for the true Originals, the very Writings, I mean, ſent from the Apoſtles, they cannot be imagined able to wraſtle with ſo great an Age, eſpecially if we reflect the reverence univerſally born the Apoſtles, and deſire to ſee what proceeded from them, expoſed them to the view and handling of ſo many, that they could not fail in a ſhort time to be much worn. What publike uſe they were of in the Church, eſpecially when there was no publike face of a Church, and the pieces ſent to one citie, were unknown in another, (perhaps for a good while unwritten) is ſomething troubleſome to gueſs, and at beſt, but pure gueſs. And for what you ſay laſt, that many of the beſt Copies ſurvived many Ages, and ſome even to this day; I ſhould have been glad if you had acquainted me with the Reaſons why you ſo confidently affirm, what

I doubt you do but *gratis* suppose: For what signs, what proofs to satisfie you, do these Copies bring that they truly deserve the Authority they pretend to; that they were of the number of those best, preserved by publike care; In fine, that they are not even fuller of faults then those which they would have corrected by them?

¶. 7. *Again, there's a very good way to discern the best, by those several Translations that have been made in or nigh the Apostles times of the Bible in Arabick, Syriack, and other Languages.*

¶ 7. Now for Translations, I should conceive the greater the variety of Translations is, the greater must the confusion be: Since certainly where they differ, as Translations of necessity must do, no one language bearing all the Proprieties of another, there lyes a suspition, the Translation has bin made out of different copies, whereof that which you have not, may, for ought you know, be better then that you have. Then again, why should one Translation yeeld to another? and who shall determine whether the fault belong to the Arabick for example, or the Syriack? So that what you have

ſaid hitherto, is reſolv'd, not onely into conjecture, whereas your cauſe requires demonſtration, but unlikely conjecture too.

¶. 8. 2. *To me this is a good Argument that there is no ſuch great corruption in our Original Copies; All thoſe Fathers which I have read (which are chiefly of the firſt, ſecond, and third Centuries) agree excellent well (though not exactly) in their manifold quotations out of Scripture, with our preſent Copies: Some corruptions there are, but nothing nigh what is imagined; the Bible was not before Printing every mans Money (as Mr. White) therefore not ſo many as now, and ſo not liable to many corruptions, beſides being exceeding dear, they muſt needs look to have them well done for their great price, but eſpecially thoſe Copies which were procured by a whole Societie for their publike uſe, or thoſe preſerved in publike Libraries.*

¶ 8. How numerous the Quotations are, which you have obſerved, I cannot tell: but muſt needs think it ſtrange every thing ſhould be ſame that riſes. I beſeech you, ſhould I preſſe to know the number of Fathers you have read, and of

places

places whoſe agreement you have obſerved, what account could your good argument yield? There be millions of Sentences in the Holy Scriptures: have you obſerved agreement in a ſingle million? nay in 100. in 50. in 40? I ſpare your modeſty, and go no lower; but beg you to reflect what it is which you call a good argument, *viz.* that becauſe there is ſome kind of agreement, of ſome few places, in ours, with more Antient Copies, which for any thing we know may be corrupted too, and theſe places I conceive, not concerning our diſputes; Therefore the whole Book is evidenc'd to be ſo free from corruption in all places, that the Salvation of mankind may ſecurely rely upon it. Next 'twould afford much matter of diſcourſe, to conſider how an agreement in Quotations ſhould be excellent, and not exact? for certainly it is a pretty odd kind of excellence which wants exactneſs. 3ly. How does it appear but that the agreement, ſuch as it is, proceeds from this, that our Tranſlators have conformed their Tranſlations, to the Fathers Quotations? In which caſe here may very well be an

agreement with the quoted places, but no likelyhood of inferring any with the reſt. But I inſiſt upon this, that ſince you acknowledge ſom diſagreement, and ſome corruptions, it is not poſſible you ſhould rigorouſly, and critically crime the Innocence of any one place in queſtion, much leſſe of all that are neceſſary to the Salvation of mankind. That before Printing there were fewer Bibles, I conceive true, but not that there were fewer faults in thoſe which were; it being certainly much eaſier to print, then write correctly, and yet no Bible comes new forth without Errata's. As much care too is now us'd of the preſſe, as could be then of the Copyer, and yet Errata's, there ſtill be, and will be while man is man, and ſubject to the Laws of tranſitory things. And for publick Libraries, and Societies, they belong to later times; when the ruſt of incertainty had already eaten too far, for any induſtry to ſcour it clean away.

¶. 9. *They had the Bible in no leſs reverence then we, yea, the very Jews (who are thought willingly to corrupt the Hebrew) ſeem more careful then the Chriſtians, as appears by*

by their Majoreth. Montanus *frees them ſufficiently from the Aſperſion, in thoſe places we (any of us) accuſe them to falſifie, they have of their own accord ſhewn the diverſities in their divers Copies, and their counting the very number of the Letters in the Bible ſufficiently pleads for them: But in general I conceive it a hard matter for any Heretick or others ſo to corrupt willingly as is pretended, both becauſe of the number diſperſed in ſeveral parts of the world, which they could not come at, and likewiſe by reaſon of the poſſeſſors of other Copies, being their enemies in opinion, would never ſuffer them without making it known to the endeavourers diſgrace, and fruſtation of the end which ſhould move them to endeavour, which muſt have been to prove their errors by thoſe apparent corruptions.*

¶ 9. Whether the *Jews* deſerve the accuſation of willful corruption or not, which is yet a moot caſe betwixt Schollers, I intend not to determine; ſince I apprehend it will contribute little to the ſettlement of our differences concerning the new Law, to ſettle in what manner they uſed the old one. Onely this is certain, that if, of learned men, ſome condemn, ſome abſolve them; the mat-

ter is left probable, and uncapable of being a ſure foundation for any thing to be built upon it. But I muſt wonder, the nice diligence you attribute to them, of counting the number of Letters in the Bible, ſhould ſeem a ſufficient plea of their ſincerity; as if it were not moſt eaſie to retain the number of letters, and yet change the words, *Sacred* and *Curſed* are the ſame in number of letters, though otherwiſe, not only moſt different, but moſt oppoſite. And for what you ſay concerning Hereticks, 'tis likely they did not corrupt all Copies, but if they corrupted any, they quite ſpoiled your Argument; for what ſhall diſtinguiſh in your grounds, betwixt a corrupt and a true copie? Yes, but they could not corrupt, becauſe their Adverſaries would have diſcovered the foul play. Therefore they ſhould not if you will; but that they have done it, is evident, almoſt of all Hereticks upon record yet remaining in the Writings of ſeveral of the Fathers. Among the reſt *Marcion* kept ſuch a nibling and gnawing the Scriptures, that he got himſelf the name of *Mus Ponticus*, a name which perhaps no antiquity will

gnaw

gnaw off. But what do we diſpute whether that may have hapned in former Ages, which, if any credit may be given to the beſt of their Authors, 'tis beyond diſpute manifeſt, has hapned in ours? *Zuinglius*, *Oſiander*, and *Kecker-man* reprehend *Luther* for corruptions in Scripture; and whether he deſerv'd it not, who had the obſtinate inſolency to maintain his Additions of the Word, [*onely*] to *Faith*, in his Tranſl. of 3 *Rom.* 28. with this Plea; Dr. *Martin Luther will have it ſo*, and ſays he is a Doctor above all the Doctors in the Papacie, do you judge. *Luther* is not behind hand with the *Zuinglians*, whom he terms fools, Antichriſts, deceivers, &c. And *Conradus Scluſſelburg* profeſſes of *Zuinglius*, that his *ſcelus* (of changeing *hoc eſt*, into *hoc ſignificat*, is by no means to be excuſed. The Tranſlations of *Baſil* and *Caſtalio*, are in *Beza's* judgement, wicked, altogether differing from the Holy Ghoſt, Sacrilegious and Ethnical; his own contains Errors too many to be noted in a Book of an ordinary bulk, if you will beleeve *Caſtalio*, and plainly change the Text, according to *Carol. Molinæus*, who alſo atteſts of *Calvin*, See Preſat. Apology.

vin, that he ſtrains the Goſpel, makes it totter up and down, and plainly adds to the Text. And, if the judgement of our Church add any thing to the credit of your own Authors, conſider that the horror ſhe had of the manifold corruptions every day produced, and the ſence ſhe had of the danger wth they threatned to the ſouls ſhe was obliged to take care of, occaſioned the prohibition, you ſo much diſlike, of reading Scriptures in Vulgar Languages, that is, corrupted; for to the Vulgar Latin the prohibition extends not.

Now, it being, as I conceive, very evident that corruptions have been made, and that willingly too: I would fain know, what ſhall hinder a corrupt Copie from out-living the Books written to diſcover the corruption, and pleading in after ages, its antiquity for a title to genuine, with as much likelihood as the trueſt Copie in the world? while there is nothing but the bare words of either to diſcern betwixt them? But you think the diſcovery of the corruption would fruſtrate the end of him that makes them, not conſidering that theſe baits are laid for ſimple onely, not learned men, whoſe

eaſineſs

easiness if the Heretick have won any credit upon, he must be the veriest Dunce in the world, if he be not able, to any crime whatsoever, to frame some, either, to them plausible, or at least, confused Defence, which they, not understanding his craft, will make use of his Authority to perswade them, his innocence suffers, not by desert, but by want of capacity in them to see it.

¶. 10. *All that plausible discourse of the possibility of Scripture-corruption only teacheth me wariness and diligence to use all means, withall confirming my Faith that it is the Word of God, seeing so many contrary minds could never have combin'd to forge it, nor those various Lections crept in, had it not been universally in respect of time and place received.*

¶. 10. That something was commended to Writing by divine Authority, you gather well; but that the Books we have and as we have them, are that something, is, if it be part of your Faith, what you will not find any thing able to confirm. Suppose an Atheist, or wittie Infidel, whose faithfulness to his nature requires severe demonstration, reply to your discourse

courſe, that, although contrary mindes could not combine to a forgery, yet they may be deceived by a forger, who for any thing appears to the contrary, may have adulterated the firſt Copie of the Original, from which adulterated Copie, all our Lections may have been derived: What return could you make to this man? Could all your wariness and diligence deny but that this caſe might happen? which if it could, what confidence could motion to him the receiving thoſe Books as Infallible and Divine, which he ſees may have been corrupted, and you are unable to ſhew but that they have been ſo. Reflect therefore if you pleaſe, what a pretty confirmation you have of your Faith, which can neither ſatisfie another, nor eſtabliſh your ſelf upon a foundation of any certainty, and leſs then certainty, and that abſolute and rigorous, cannot in theſe matters be a foundation. I paſs therefore to the next Section, after I have obſerved, that this neither proves there is ſo much as one corruption leſs in the Bible, then your Adverſary thinks may be, and that although it had proved many leſs, it would

nothing

nothing have advanced your purpose, since, that Corruptions may be there, that is for ought you know, are there, does as much destroy your pretence to certaintie, as if you knew they actually were there.

Sect. II.

Incertainty of the Sence of Scripture from the bare letter.

¶ 1 *THe next material Question is how to understand these Scriptures, which we may see sufficiently to agree, because the Original Languages are not now commonly known, equivocations incident to all writings and words,* &c.

¶ 1 THat which you call the next material Question, I do not comprehend how you come to state in the manner you do. I presume you intend to oppose the 8th. Art.

and following Sections of the 2d. Dialogue, where, several incertainties neceſſarily ſpringing out of the variety of Tranſlations, Copies, *&c.* being already handled, is examined what muſt needs follow from this, that the Scripture, in the ſuppoſition there were but one authentical Copy extant, is a Book written in words of men. So that the Queſtion there ſeems not to be of the method how to underſtand the Scripture, but of this, whether they may be underſtood with that certainty which in our buſineſſe is requiſite.

¶ 2. *Here I wonder at the excellent Mr.* White, *not to have prevented this my difficulty; that the ſame difficulty lies as heavy, yea heavier upon Tradition, for that came by the ſame way (as you will confeſſe) firſt delivered in thoſe Original Tongues, and muſt be Tranſlated (by word of Mouth) and Expounded even into our Native Languages, before we can be made ſenſible of them; and is it not as hard for me, to tell you that in Engliſh, which another told me in Latin, as for me (or another better learnt than my ſelf) to Tranſlate*

ſo

ſo much written to my hand in Latine, into Engliſh, ſurely this later is the exacteſt way.

¶ 2. Here you muſt give me leave to wonder too, but 'tis that you raiſe ſuch a difficulty, and attribute ſo much heavineſs to it upon ſo light ground: Truly, I am ſo far from confeſſing that Scripture and Tradition came by the ſame way, that I conceive it impoſſible they ſhould do ſo: For Scripture contains a determinate number of words, which are the ſame to whoever reads them; Tradition is not at all confin'd, but uſes fewer, and more obſcure to ingenious perſons; more, & clearer to thoſe who are duller, and conſequently is not ſubject to tranſlation; ſince certainly I cannot be ſaid to have tranſlated, if what another hath told me in 500 words of French, I tell you in 100 of Engliſh: What you aſſume therefore, that Chriſtianity was firſt delivered in the Original tongues, is in this ſenſe true, that it was firſt preached to thoſe Nations, whoſe Vulgar Languages were thoſe which we call Original, but that gives you no pretence to add, 'twas tranſlated into ours, it being delivered neither to them nor

us in a ſet form of words, which might be tranſlated, but ſo preached to both in our ſeveral Vulgar Languages, that the people underſtood the meaning of what their Preachers delivered to them, and were not left to gueſs at it by ſcanning the various, and therefore doubtful, ſignification of the words, they expreſs'd it in. So that Tradition is not ſubject to any of the uncertainties which writing cannot be exempt from; a truth, which the next word, *expounded*, ſeems to confeſs. For it being the buſineſs of Expoſition to render the Text clear, if the Goſpel were by tradition expounded to the people, there muſt have been a great fault in the Expoſitor, if there remained any uncertainty or doubt in them.

¶. 3. *You will ſay perhaps not the words, but the ſenſe was delivered by Tradition at firſt in ſeveral expreſſions.*

Anſw. *Yet ſtill by words liable to all thoſe difficulties incident to Scripture, yea greater, when they again tranſmit it to others of another language. Scripture too has the ſame truths eſſential to Chriſtianity in divers expreſſions, ſeveral places almoſt in every Book; and whether this be not the ſurer way of tranſmitting*

mitting truths, let Papias *his example witneſs, who pretended to hear the Apoſtles themſelves teach the Doctrine of* Millenaries, *had he tranſmitted the very words in Writing, others, having judgement which he wanted, as* Euſebius, *would have ſeen his miſtake, by this appears in general, Writing the ſureſt way,* Litera ſcripta manet.

¶ 3. 'Tis true then, that not a ſet form of words, but a determinate ſence came down to us by Tradition, by the means of words indeed, but not as you ſay, liable to all thoſe difficulties incident to Scripture. For though words are neceſſary to both, yet there is this difference, that in Traditon, where, by the obſervation of the Maſter, or notice of the Scholler any doubt is perceived, 'tis preſently explicated by other words, till it be perfectly taken away, and the thing underſtood: Whereas Scripture is confin'd to thoſe preciſe words it contains, concerning which if either your ſelf have any doubt, or another raiſe it in you, you have no means of ſatisfaction; for how can you come to the knowledge of the thing ſignified, while you are at a loſs about the ſign? that ſign, which is

all you have to trust to, being to explicate another thing, not it self. Now, if you reflect that the Gospel was preacht, or delivered by word of mouth, with that care and time, that it was not only well understood by the people, but setled deeply in their souls, by a constant practise and high esteem; you will see that since they understood the doctrine delivered to them, and could not forget it by reason of their constant practise, nor lose it by reason of their multitude, Tradition has not one of the difficulties made to Scripture. This advantage too, which orall delivery has above writing, ought not be forgotten, that the livelines of the voice, and aptnes of the gesture, and such companions of words fitly pronounced, do infinitely contribute to make them be understood. We see Ironical expressions differ no otherwise from serious ones, then in the motion of a lip or eye, and yet how vast is the difference? Nay, the actions of the speaker suited to, and joyned with the circumstance in which he speaks, is perhaps of all Interpreters the best, and admits the least doubt of his meaning. Writing therefore, necessari-

ly

ly wanting theſe helps, muſt of neceſſity want alſo a moſt efficacious means of making the words it preſents to the eye intelligible, which theſe enjoy that are convey'd to us by the ear. That Scripture has couched in it moſt, if not all truths eſſential to Chriſtianity in divers Expreſſions, I conceive to be true; but if you will compare it to Tradition, you muſt add, that theſe truths are indiſputably acknowledged, and practiſed both with conſtancy, and high eſteem by a multitude, and I ſhal then not think it inferiour to Tradition, with which perhaps 'twill be the very ſame. And for the example of *Papias*, I am ſure it is nothing againſt me, it being evident there want the conditions neceſſary to Tradition: *Viz.* Of being openly and conſtantly preached to ſuch a multitude, as can certainly witneſs of it, that perfectly underſtand it, and practiſe according to it: And I think it makes for me, ſince in all likelihood the error proceeded from this, that the words uſed in diſcourſe by the Apoſtle, were miſ-underſtood by ſome of the hearers; and what hapned to them when they were ſpoken, I know nothing

can hinder them from being liable to, after they are written: So that even that example concludes that all error proceeds from the deceitfulness of set words, which Tradition not being tied to, is also freed from the inconveniences they are the occasion of.

¶ 4. *We may to our comfort remember, this Age affords such as are as well skilled in the Originals, yea, better then many Learned men, that lived several hundreds of years before us. I confess (what they are forced to acknowledge) some things we cannot yet know, by reason of those difficulties: No more could the Church for above 12 hundred years ago, yet as then so now, we have sufficient, though not all, light to salvation only out of Scripture. Because we cannot understand all things (some whereof in Scripture* S. Peter *tells us are hard to be understood) shall we say we can understand nothing certainly? Why should we doubt our Saviour was born of the Virgin* Mary, *more then that we understand any sentence we hear commonly from one another, although there be no other way then Scripture to know it. We make no doubt but we understand a place of* Plato, Aristotle, Tully, *&c. and cannot God write as intelligibly?*

¶ 4.

¶. 4. What the learning is of men of this age, I conceive very unneceſſary to examine, eſpecially ſince all the uſe you make of it, is to affirm confidently, *That we have ſufficient light to ſalvation onely out of Scripture*; to which all I ſhall return, is, that ſo critical an Exceptor againſt Arguments, ſhould not himſelf uſe for one, the Concluſion barely ſaid over. That *we can underſtand nothing certainly*, is not Mr *Whites* Poſition, but that we cannot underſtand enough for the ſalvation of mankind with certainty requiſite to that effect, and till you ſay ſomething againſt him, I have nothing to ſay againſt you. Why we ſhould doubt of our Saviours being born of the Virgin *Mary*, I know not, and were there no other Readers of Scripture, but ſuch as you, and I, perhaps none would; but if any do, as I think *Helvidius* did, and you have no other means of convincing him but by words; which a ſubtle Critick will ſhew are capable of other ſenſes; pray how will you hinder a multitude, with whom an opinion of learning, and holineſs has gotten him credit, from following him into damnation? of the parity be-

between Scripture and *Aristotles* writings you will give me occasion to speak more fully by and by.

¶ 5. *Surely God would be understood by all, seeing he commands all not only to read his Law, but to write it upon their posts and doors and Phylacteries, and be continually talking of those things that are necessary for salvation,* Deut. 6.7. *and by his Apostles, tells us, that he intends so to doe, not always to speak in Parables,* John 16.25, 26. *and in* 2 Cor. 4. 2, 3, 4. *not handling the Word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth, commending our selves to every mans conscience in the sight of God, but if our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that beleeve not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God should shine unto them.* Prov. 8. 9. *They are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge; but what more plain then that in* Hab. 2.2. *And the Lord answered me and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon Tables, that he may run that readeth.*

¶. 5. For the citations you fill the next Paraph with, I profess I am at a loss to find any opposition in them to what

what I am maintaining: The *Dialogues* ſay, Equivocation, the nature of the Original tongues, their being ceaſed, *&c.* cauſes an uncertainty of the ſenſe of Scripture; and you reply that God commanded his Law to be written upon Poſts, Doors, and Philacteries; that he intended to ſpeak to his Apoſtles without Parables, that S. *Paul* did not handle the word of God deceitfully, that the words of wiſdom are plain to him that underſtandeth; and that the Prophet was commanded to write a Viſion plain: Does any of this, or all prove that equivocation, *&c.* brings in no incertainty, or that it and the reſt, are not found in Scripture? This is what I conceive it had been proper to have ſpoken to, every thing elſe being not the Queſtion. But to ſpeak minutely to each, I muſt tell you, the Comments I have ſeen upon what you urge out of *Deuteronomie*, apprehend the command mentioned not to intend ſo much a literal obedience (for certainly all could not read, every one had not Philacteries, &c.) as it indeavoured to make it the buſineſs of the *Jews* to ſink the Law into their hearts by a perpetual practiſe

ctiſe and high eſteem. But the Queſtion is not, Whether the Scripture be not plain enough for the intent for which it was made; (you know the Dialogues affirm the Motives of the love of God and our neighbour, *&c.* are eaſily found in the Bible, by a diſcreet reading, and not only that, but a man may by ſuch a reading become a perfect beleeving Catholick) but whether it were intended for the effect which you attribute to it, *Viz.* to be the rule of Faith, that is, alone to ſecure the paſſage for all mankind to heaven, when ſtrength of wit, ſtrength of malice, and ſtronger then both, the weakneſs of mortality, and repugnance of humane frailty, all joyn to ſtop it up. This we deny, and not but that Scripture may have been well enough underſtood when 'twas firſt written: For certainly, while the Circumſtances laſt in which, and for which 'tis made, it is much eaſier to comprehend the meaning of a writing; then afterwards when they being paſt, we are left to gueſſe at the ſenſe without other help then the bare letter, which we are apt to interpret every one his own way. 'Tis true therfore that Scripture was intended

intended to be intelligible to thoſe to whom it was written, but not to after Ages without other means. To exemplifie in the *Jews*, of whom your Objection runs, did not the *Phariſees* and *Saducees* (not to mention the reſt of their Sects) both admit the Scripture, and yet ſo far diſagree in underſtanding it, that many times they were both wrong? Neither would I have you reply, They were out, in things only of leſs concern, in not fundamentals; for beſides that this, would you but determine what a Fundamental were, might be ſhew'd to be falſe, it gives no ſatisfaction to the Argument, although admited for true; ſince unqueſtionably God did not write any thing at all, with deſign to inſtruct the Reader, fundamental, or not fundamental, which he would not have underſtood; 'twere blaſphemy to impute ſuch folly to him; if then they failed in any thing, they underſtood not ſomething which God intended ſhould be underſtood. 'Tis therefore in my opinion, very clear, that his intention laſted no longer, then the circumſtances which accompanied the action, and which being paſt, the bare

letter

letter was no longer ſufficient without other helps, their conſtant practice, for example, the beſt Interpreter of a Law, which while they adhered to it, kept them right in all things commended by it, and by it the ſenſe of the letter was cleared to after Ages, which to the firſt, was ſufficiently determined by other circumſtances; although not ſo but that, even then, it was to a wrangling Caviller very poſſible to be wreſted, as the example of St. *Pauls* writings undeniably evince of the New Teſtament. The following one from *John* 16. ſeems farther from the purpoſe: For how can you deduce any thing relating to it out of this, That our Saviour told his Apoſtles, the time was coming when he would ſpeak to them without Parables? I conceive he means the fortie days converſation with them after his Paſſion, in which, becauſe he made them fully underſtand what he ſaid, will it ever follow that every one fully and certainly underſtands what is written? Farther off, if a greater diſtance may be, is what you cite from 2 *Cor.* where the Apoſtle having in his abſence, been defamed by ſome pſeudo-Apoſtle to the *Corinthians*, juſtifies himſelf

himself, and his fellow labourers, affirming they performed their Obligation of preaching the Gospel sincerely and uprightly; which what it has to do with our Question, indeed I cannot imagin. That from the *Proverbs* (if it may be meant of the Scripture, which I doubt it cannot, the Text seeming very plain against that sense) is against you; for it requires an aptitude and promptness in the Reader, which is to confess, where these qualities are not, the plainness, you urge, must also vanish. Now since these dispositions consist not with pride and obstinacy, and in controversies of Faith, heresie must of necessity take one of the parts, and heresie cannot be without pride and obstinacy, nothing can be plainer then that these dispositions cannot be in the Readers on both sides, and that Scripture by consequence, is no effectual weapon against one of them. As for the last, it is I think farthest of all, the command signifying no more then this, that whereas Prophecies use to be couched in mysterious language, the Prophet was directed here to do otherwise, and write the vision plainly, that is, not mysteriously. Your plain argu-

ment therefore ſtands thus, that becauſe one viſion was commanded to be written not miſteriouſly, therefore the bare letter of Scripture is a ſufficient means to as much certainty as is neceſſary to the Salvation of mankind, which is plainly, no argument at all.

¶. 6. *Truths neceſſary are plain enough, though others only profitable be not all ſo, nor is it requiſite, ſeeing God hath not thought good they ſhould be all ſo, elſe he would have made them plain too, indeed to them that are not duely qualified, what will be plain? A man ſhut his eyes againſt any thing, but let a man come with a good minde, ready to fetch, not bring any meaning, obſerve the drift of the place, what went before, what followes, compare obſcure with plain places, heartily pray unto God; ſuch a man will certainly ſee what ſhall be ſufficient for his Salvation, if he live accordingly.*

¶. 6. This paragraph conjectures a man may be ſaved by Scripture alone, and ſince it does no more, I might, if I would, make a drawn match of it, by oppoſing my No, to your I. But ſincerity and diligence being virtues which God may very much favour, and ſince a weak veſſel will

will bring a man to his Haven, who ſails in a perpetual calm, I cannot ſee what it prejudices me to admit, what you ſay, to be true. For we enquire not what upright honeſty will be ſatisfied with, but how to convince wrangling obſtinacie? and how to be able to allay, or at leaſt live in thoſe ſtorms of doubts, which, either our own too curious natures, or the malice of others is ſure to raiſe in a multitude, eſpecially ſuch a one as Providence has made us parts of.

¶. 7. *I ſee not what Objections can deſtroy this, and wonder to read in ſome of your diſputing againſt us ſuch expreſſions as theſe; No cauſe imaginable could avert our will from giving the function of Supream and ſole Iudge to holy writ, if both the thing were not impoſſible in it ſelf, and if both Reaſon and Experience did not convince our underſtanding, that by this Aſſertion contentions are encreaſed and not ended. We acknowledge holy Scripture to be a moſt perfect Rule, for as much as a writing can be a Rule, &c. Would you ſtand to that, Scripture is a moſt perfect Rule, as any Rule can be, this Aſſertion would ſoon end contentions between us. Why cannot Scripture be a perfect Rule without need of un-*

written Traditions, to end controversies by? I see not the impossibility. I would you would be pleased to teach me; All that the Apostles taught and delivered to their Successors, were all truths, and were they not sufficient to be a Rule to Judge by, whether written or by word of mouth? I think all those truths they delivered were a sufficient Rule, for their Successors could have nothing else to Judge by, except they pretend to an infallible Spirit; well, then could not all of that truth be written which was delivered, surely, yea, for I know not any thing one man may speak to another by word of mouth, but he may write it, therefore it is possible such a sufficient Rule may be made (I prove now only the possibility) and if it may, his Assent is due to our Doctrine, because he protests to have no other imaginable ground, that could avert his will from giving it the function of supreme and sole Judge.

¶. 7. The next Paraph opposes a pair of Assertions, which since I know not whose they are, I hope you will not take it amiss, if I do not engage my self to defend. 'Tis well, if I can preserve Mr. *White* himself from so strong an enemy as you are. For the Positions themselves

I

I conceive the second absolutely false; and that a Writing may be contrived with much more perfection, that is fitness to be a Rule, then the Scripture is. And for the first (though I conceive it true, as the case stands, so many uncertainties from so many several causes unavoidably crowding into the writing we have) yet abstractedly to examine whether a writing may not be framed without them, is a Question so little to our purpose, that I beseech you give me leave to say no more of it, then that while we have no better words, nor better skill in ordering them then yet are known, tis to be doubted no one Book will be exempted from the face of all, even those which by design are the plainest, as Laws, which no industry could yet contrive so but that the moot-cases bear a notable proportion to the resolv'd ones: As for their discourse, 'tis agreed that Truths are a sufficient rule to judge by, provided they be sufficiently, that is, certainly known to be Truths. 'Tis also agreed, they may be written; but we deny the sense of that Writing can always sufficiently be made out by its bare Characters, without other assistance; and this

which yet is our onely question, your discourse takes no notice of, but supposing to be truth, and to be known to be truth, is the same thing, roves, handsomly indeed, but yet roves.

¶ 8. *Again, to prove Scripture may be a Supream rule, to decide all necessary controversies, I pray answer me, Whether the determinations of your Councils can end controversies? I suppose you affirm it: Those determinations are printed by you, to be read by all, and be such a Rule, can they be understood? I have read of two of your Doctors both present at the Council of Trent, oppose each other, and alledge the decree against each other; so that your determinations are not always sufficient, no, nor ever can they be, if what you affirm of Scripture be true, Viz. insufficient to determine: For suppose your decrees most plain, how shall I be certain this is the meaning of those determinations, If I cannot, till a further determination come out to explain the first, I ask again, How I shall be certain that I understand and have the right meaning of this second: What by another determination again? Why so, I shall be querying in infinitum, and never be sure, unless I rest in some*

one

no determination which may be sufficiently intelligible to me, to satisfie and assertain me of the truth, and if Mans writings can be a determination and sufficient Rule to beget certain truth in me, why not Gods?

¶. 8. The Parity, you next urge, betwixt Scripture and Councels, I should think of great force, if there were nothing but the bare letter in both. But in the former the word is the only interpreter of the sence, in the later, the word is interpreted by the sence: in the first, the sence is to be accomodated to the word, in the 2d. the word to the sence. To explicate my self, be pleas'd to reflect, That Bishops going into Councel, go not to find out a faith which before they knew not, but to certifie that which they already know. Then, before they agree upon words to expresse it by, they have in their heads that which they would expresse: and when the words are agreed on, they perfectly know what they mean by them, and in which of the sences, if they be capable of more than one, they are to be taken in. This they testifie by their practise when they are out of Councel, and so leave to their posterity, not only a Rule, but

but a Method to preſerve it from being wreſted by the craft, and perverſeneſſe of their Adverſaries. Now in Scripture the caſe is quite different; There are none to tell you the ſence of the word in queſtion, neither can the word it ſelf help you, for 'tis of it you doubt. In our caſe too, 'tis interpreted quite againſt the common practiſe, and therefore (which give me leave to hint by the way) the interpreter ought not to be contented the word may bear his ſence, but muſt evidently ſee it can bear no other.

For he that leaves the common practiſe to which the word may be accomodated, when his Salvation depends upon the choice, for this that the word may alſo be accomodated to another ſence, I doubt apprehends but ſlightly the value of his Soul, and what it is to be eternally, or happy, or miſerable. But this by the bye. The printed determinations therefore of Councils barely are not our Rule, but the printed determinations underſtood and practiſed; And were the Scripture ſo qualifi'd, I know not what condition it would want neceſſary to a Rule. In the mean time the inſtance of the Tridentine

Doctors

Doctors seems to be as much against you as a Thing can be: for what possibility of certainty from words, when the very same are cited in behalf of contradictories; and if a verbal foundation be found weak in Councils, how can you think 'twill sustain a building of Scripture? Though in this particular case the accident has nothing of wonder, since the Council abstaining, as far as I remember, purposely, from determining either side, and speaking abstractedly, must of necessity leave a colour for both, and a latitude for wit and fancie to work on, and determine which side they please.

Sect. III.

Scripture, critically managed, not sufficient to decide Controversies.

¶. 1. The 3d. *Question whether Scripture can determine Controversies?* 1. *We affirm not, all possible Controversies of Religion can satisfactorily be determined by Scripture, neither do I think you*

you dare say they can by your Traditions, but 2ly. *all necessary to Salvation may. In the* 15th. *Encounter of the Apol.* pag 136. *Mr.* White *makes use of an old Objection to disprove Scriptures sufficiency in general, which truly I should not have thought worth the taking notice of, did it not come from Mr.* White, *whom I much honour, and find more Rational than many others of your Controversie writers I have since Read; it is this Scripture hath not these* 1600 *years ended Controversies, therefore it is not a sufficient Rule.* 1. *He speaks more then he proves of* 1600 *years. As to the experience since* Luthers *time, it's plainly false, that not one point has been resolved by it; that Christ is the* Messias *promised, that through Faith in his name Salvation is to be had, and many others have been, and are resolved, and agreed unto by Protestants who own not your Traditions; but what Wonder Scripture does not end the feud between you and us, seeing you will not be ruled by Scripture as the Supreme Rule to decide by; he might as well have concluded against traditions, because they have not yet ended the Controversies since* Luthers *time between you and us,*

who

who doth not acknowledge your Traditions as a ſupream Rule to judge by.

¶ 1. The next Reaſon begins with a Queſtion, which as you ſtate it, has no oppoſition to the *Dialogues*, for after they have ſhewn how points of Religion may be decided, and controverſies determined by Scripture, me thinks it ſhould not be queſtioned whether that may be done, which they ſhew how 'tis done. The difference betwixt you, though you ſay nothing of it, is of the certainty of determining Controverſies; their Poſition being, That a diſcreet and diligent peruſal of Scripture will make a man a perfect Catholick, but not with that ſteady firmneſs as to be able to evince his Religion before a Critical Judge, againſt a wrangling and craftie Adverſary; and this is your task to oppoſe, if you will oppoſe the *Dialogues*. To the experience Maſter *White* glances at in his fifteenth *Encounter*, you anſwer, he proves notwhat he ſays of ſixteen hundred years, which is true; but ſure to your ſecond thoughts that place, which profeſſes not to treat the Queſtion, and onely men-

mentions it by the by, will not seem proper for a large proof: Yet if you desire to see one, his *Tabula Suffragiales* will serve you, where he handles that question largely.

And for what you say, since *Luthers* time that many points have been resolv'd by Scripture, though he speak of Points controverted betwixt Catholicks and Protestants, and so your Position does not directly thwart him, yet I conceive you are in the wrong, and doubt whether any one point ever have been resolv'd amongst the adversaries of the Roman Church, meerly by Scripture. 'Tis true, there are several, in which they all agree, and Catholicks with them, as those you instance in; but not because Scripture has reconciled their differences concerning them, but because they never owned any differences to reconcile. Consult Histories faithfully and impartially, and if you find ever plainly convinced another, or generally any other agreement then this, that the Point controverted belonged not to salvation, and so either part permitted to keep their own opinion, I shall learn something of you, which yet I am very unacquainted

of.

of. Mean while the points, you say are agreed, I conceive, are so onely, because they have not been questioned; whereof I take the reason to be the nature of man, which being accustomed to any one thing, cannot be brought to the opposite but by degrees and time, a quality which grounds that Maxime, *Nemo repente fit pessimus.* So I conceive that *Luther*, being brought up & long inured to Religion, though Passion obliged him to renounce some points of it, yet was withheld by the course of nature from following his Principles whether they would at last have brought him, into infidelity. His successors still went farther, and I do not see that where they exceeded him, either himself in his lifetime, or Schollers after him were able to correct and bound them by Scripture; but that every one had as fair a plea for deserting him, as he for deserting the Church: Whether the Clew would have brought him, had he pursued it far enough, the fifth Monarchy and Quakerism will inform you; which though perhaps you may look on but as Bastards, and think it strange they should be laid to his charge, yet I cannot tell any thing

ſhould hinder you from acknowledging them his iſſue, but their deformity; for they profeſs Scripture as much as he, and have by his principles and example as great a liberty to interpret it. You will ſay they err in their Interpretation: True, but ſo did he, and as long as they follow what ſeems the truth to them, they do all that he did; and if that ſeeming be a Plea for him againſt poſſeſſion and authoty, I ſee not how you can deny it them. Againſt ſome of theſe, and perhaps this Labyrinth has many more windings we are yet unacquainted with, 'tis poſſible you may have occaſion to diſpute ſome of the points you conceive agreed of: and till experience ſatisfie you of the ſucceſs, you would do well not to be too confident of the favour of Scripture: In the mean time pray do not take that for reſolved, which was never diſputed.

As to what you ſay, that we refuſe to be ruled by Scripture, you do us wrong, for by acknowledging it the Word of God, we bind our ſelves to accept whatſoever can be proved it teaches; ſo that if it be true, as you ſay that your Religion may be convinced out of Scripture, your victory

dory over us is certain. Nay we have one Copie too, which to us is authentical, and which in Diſputation we refuſe not, whereas, when you are preſſed you flie from one to another; And how you, that pretend to rely on Scripture, can have fairer play ſhewn you, then a Book brought, which your Adverſary acknowledges to be Scripture, and profeſſes an abſolute obedience, and ſubmiſſion to whatever it ſays, indeed I cannot imagin.

Since then nothing more can be required on our ſides, pray charge us not with ſuch injurious ſcandals; and take it not amiſs, if I tell you with that plainneſs, which in concerns of the ſoul, being a duty of Charitie, ſhould never be look'd upon as a breach of civility, that what you ſo loudly call the *Word of God*, and with the Majeſtie of ſo great a Name, endeavour to dazle your adverſaries eyes, while in truth you blind your own, proves, when faithfully and ſeverely ſcan'd, no other thing, but your own meerfancy, to which you accommodate the outward Word in which the true Word of God is contained, and becauſe you can do ſo, break communion

with us, because we prefer another sense, which the words also agree withall, suitable to our constant and universal practise, and which to leave upon no better inducement, I must confess I know not how to excuse from downright madness. Moreover, some of our Controvertists, laying down in condescendence to you, their own assured Arms, Tradition, have engaged with you at your own weapon, critical handling of Scripture, of whose endeavours, I am content almost even partiality it self should be Judge, being very confident no Byas can be great enough to draw a reasonable nature, so far wide of Truth, as to pronounce us, in that kind of war, overcome.

When you say Tradition has not ended controversies, you express where the fault lies, *Viz.* in that not acknowledging them, it being unpossible that Judge should end a difference, whose sentence is refused by either of the parties: But then this is not for want of necessary qualities in him, but submission in them: We refuse not to make Scripture sole Judge our of fear it should give sentence against us; we know its sence much better then you,

you, and know 'tis for us, and if you think you can convince us by it, do it, we both muſt and will ſubmit; but out of fear, by its not giving ſentence at all, our diſſentions ſhould never come to an end. We earneſtly long to ſee all the ſheep of Chriſt quietly feeding again in one fold, and that unhappy wall of diviſion, which ſo long has ſeparated them, battered down; and becauſe we do ſo, cannot but teſtifie Scripture is no fit Engine to do it: 'Twas to us ſhe was given, not to you, and we know her efficacy is more in times of peace, then War; that ſhe is more proper to increaſe charity, then beget faith; and that being principally intended to ſanctifie the faithful, ſhe does ordinarily require they ſhould firſt be faithful, that they may afterwards be ſanctified. Had you the ſame diſpoſition to peace, you would either effectually ſhew the Scripture a fit Judge to decide controverſies, critically and frowardly handled, or appeal to ſome other: for he that pretends a deſire of an end, in order to which he will obſtinately beleeve thoſe to be means, which both from reaſon and experience he may learn to be none, and

will not be brought to use other, is convinced to do no more then barely pretend it.

¶ 2. *Reason, in things that depend upon it, is often a sufficient rule, yet many cannot be brought to an agreement by it even in things which are evident & by others demonstrated; shall we then think it sufficient to disprove it a rule because some, yea many are not made to accord with it?* Mr. White p. 153. *grants the Jews might have been (though they were not) led to Christ and salvation by Scripture, if they had interpreted it with charity and humility: And* p. 110. *However the marks of the Church are apparant enough in Scripture, if there want not will in the seeker to acknowledg them: If this be not to contradict himself I know not what is. To ill-disposed or undisposed refractory minds nothing is sufficient. I see a monstrous difficultie for you to understand Scripture aright, who are resolved to make no other sence, then what agrees with your supposed Traditions.*

¶ 2. That which I conceive to be the drift of this Paragraph, *Viz.* That 'tis perhaps more often, the fault of the parties, then of the Judge, that differences

are

are kept alive, is certainly true: But you apply it not, neither, as we think, can you do it with any appearance to conclude we are in fault, that bind our selves, even in this kind of tryall to much stricter conditions then you will be brought to do. For, besides the reverence we bear the Scripture, even to an absolute submission to whatever it says, (then which you neither do, nor can do more) we also bring you a Book, which we so acknowledg to be Scripture, that in disputation we refuse it not; would you do so much perhaps more good might be done then is, mean time this is certain, that more cannot be required of us.

Next you pretend a contradiction from two places which you cite; and I cannot tell whether you mean those places contradict one another, wch nevertheless seem to say the same thing, or that both those places contradict the former Doctrine: Now that asserts two things; 1. That Scripture does not speak plain enough to convince a wrangling Critick. 2. That it does speak plain enough to satisfie an humble and charitable Reader, in which if you see any contradiction, you see

not

not onely what I cannot, but what I conceive is not there to be seen.

¶. 3. Page 137. *Mr.* White *seems to grant (what I cannot tell how he can deny) that the Scripture is as well able to make us understand its meaning, as* Plato *or* Aristotle *theirs, but the supposition where all the venom lies is concealed (as he is pleased to phrase it) so the Scripture was written of those controversies which since are risen; I see no danger in this poison rightly understood, God delivering those things in Scripture which are sufficient for salvation, speaks so, that he may be as well understood as* Plato, Aristotle, &c. *in their Writings, then the Reader of holy Writ, (that comes to it, as* page 153. *the Iewes should have done with charitie and humilitie, which would actually have brought them to the truth) may have the true meaning of Gods Word, as to the points of faith and practice; Now having the truth, cannot he see that error which shall afterwards arise to be falshood, because it is contrary to the truth which he has out of Scripture,* linea recta est Judex sui & obliqui. *But strange opinions may spring up, which can neither be proved nor disproved satisfactorily by Scripture, nor is it necessary all possible controversies should be*

de-

determinable, I do not think you pretend to this kind of Omniſcience by your Traditions. I pray tell me, how does your Church confute new errors, which were not ſtarted in the Apoſtles time, by thinking only that they are falſe, or by looking upon thoſe truths, which it pretends the Apoſtles at firſt delivered before thoſe errors came up, which it ſees are contrary to thoſe received truths: unleſs you pretend to new Revelations to diſcover new errors by, and what poyſon is there in making written truths the ſtreight Rule to meaſure future enormities by, more then to make unwritten truth ſerve for that end.

¶. 3. The next Paragraph inſiſts upon the Parity betwixt Scripture, and the writings of *Plato*, or *Ariſtotle*, touching which, what you ſay Mr. *White* ſeems to grant, that the one is as well able to make us underſtand its meaning, as the other; I muſt tell you does but ſeem ſo, and 'tis a wonder to me you obſerved it not, the very next page, but one, to that you cite, being employ'd in ſhewing the way of writing us'd, by *Ariſtotle*, has a great advantage towards being underſtood, over that of the Bible. But he denies not but both may be underſtood; and

and that ſtuff you weave into this Concluſion: That a Reader of Scripture may come to the truth, and by it judge ariſing Errors. Pray what's this againſt Mr. *White*; becauſe he may arrive at truth, ſhall he therefore be fixed there with that conſtancy that no ſubtlety can ſtagger him? Shall his Humility and Charity, which introduced him, provide him too with Arms to maintain the place, and defend it againſt the aſſaults of Wit and Malice leagued together? I ſee no glimmering of ſuch a conſequence; which nevertheleſſe ſhould have been yours, for, till you are there, your Journeys end is ſtil before you.

Beſides, your foundation, that all things ſufficient for Salvation are delivered in Scripture, meaning the Salvation of mankind, is not firm, eſpecially making, as you do afterwards, every one of the Goſpels to contain a perfect ſum of what is neceſſary to be believed and practiſed; for ſome things, and thoſe neceſſary to Salvation, are beleived meerly upon the account of Traditions, as the Scripture it ſelf &c. Thoſe ſtrange opinions too; which, you ſay, may ſpring up, may perhaps concern

things

things necessary to Salvation, which, if they can neither be proved nor disproved satisfactorily by Scripture, plainly there is not by your method, any satisfaction left us in things necessary to Salvation.

And for what you urge last, that written truths may be as streight a Rule as unwritten ones, 'tis true, provided they be agreed on to be truths; But the question is not whether written truths will convince a rising error, but whether written words will so convince the truths they contain to, whoever rises up in error against them, that no Artifice shall be able to pervert their fidelity, and introduce another sence into the same sounds. An instance may make the thing clearer. Let the Church, before *Arius*, have had no better weapon to defend her faith of the Consubstantiality of the *Father and Son*, then these and the like words. *Ego & Pater unum sumus*: and you will make me much wiser then I am, if you render it possible shee should preserve her self from being overcome by the craft of that Heretick, who would have proved at least plausibly, as Hereticks us'd to do, by the

Rule

Rule of conferring one place with another, that those words ought not to be understood of an unity of Substance; since our Saviour elsewhere prays his Apostles may be one, as his Father and he are one; which evidently contradicting a substantial unity, The former words ought to yield to these plain ones, *Pater major me est.* 'Twas not then by those words, but by the sence of them, so firmly rooted in her practise, that neither the wit, nor power of *Arius*, joyn'd with a perverse and lasting obstinacy, could shake it, that she decided the controversie, and transmitted sound Doctrine to her posterity; Shee saw his interpretation contradicted her sence, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and continued by Tradition, but no body could see it contradicted the words, which his wit made as favourable to him as her. By which very same Method (to answer your Question in your own words) I conceive the Church would at this day confute new errors, *viz* by looking upon the truths first delivered by the Apostles, and since preserved by her practise, not the words in which they were delivered.

To

To sum up your Paraph therefore in short, 'tis true, that *Linea recta est judex sui & obliqui*; 'Tis true, that truth is *linea recta*? 'Tis true also, that the Reader, duly qualified, may by due reading Scripture come to truth; but that this truth will be enough to serve all the exigencies of all mankind, in all circumstances, or that what satisfied his sincerity and diligence will be able to satisfie all manner of peevishness and obstinacy, are two Positions, which I see you have not, and think you cannot prove. There is no doubt but *truth* ought to judge, which is the thing you do say: But if there be a doubt which is truth, I conceive bare words, which were perhaps sufficient to discover hers to charity and humility, will not be able to convince her against malicious craft and pride; which is what you should, but do not prove.

¶ 4. *If words would affright a man*, Mr. White *doth it by search after evidence of Argument. In the same* page 137. *he requires any one Book in the whole Bible whose Theam is now controverted; he mentions S.* Johns *Gospel, which was to shew the Godhead of Christ, but that is not so directly*

(saith he) *his Theam as the miraculous life of our Saviour, from whence his Divinity was to be deduced. And* page 153. John *intended only such particulars as prove that Christ was God, in which later expression if he do not seem (as to me he doth) to contradict his former, the former making* S. Johns *intent a History, the latter a Discourse only (as his word is) of a controversal truth.*

¶ 4. The contradiction you glance at here, will not, even with your assistance, so much as seem such to any diligence of mine; and since I cannot overcome it, I must beseech you to pardon that dulness which will let me see but one sence in these two expressions: *Viz.* S. *John* wrote the miraculous life of our Saviour, so as his Divinity might be deduced from it, and S. *John* in his History specifies such particulars as prove the Divinity of our Saviour.

¶ 5. *Yet this he clearly says,* S. John *made an Antidote against that error, then beginning, yet (as he) the design so unsuccessful, that never any heresie was more powerful, then that which opposed the truth intended by his Book, whence he seems to infer, Scripture no sufficient Rule to decide, because the*

Ari-

Arians *were not silenced by it. I demand why the* Arians *were not convinced by that Book written on purpose to oppose that error which they held, by a very large discovering the contrary truth; was it because there was not evidence enough of that truth, which* S. John *onely intended in his whole Book; surely you must say so, and then I pray consider what you say, whether it be not imputing weakness to* S. John, *or to the Holy Ghost writing by him,* quod horrendum, *that he should set himself to write a whole Book in which (as* Mr Whites *words are) he intended only such particulars as prove that Christ was God, and yet not prove it sufficiently: If* S. John *did prove it sufficiently, why were not the* Arians *convinced by it; surely the fault was not in the want of evidence of those miraculous actions (which, our Saviour saith, prove him to be the Son of God, and one with the Father) but in their wills, I say it was their own fault; so then notwithstanding all* Mr White *hath said, I conclude the Scripture may be a sufficient means to decide controversies by, although refractory minds be not silenced by it. Neither has God promised that obstinate opposers of*

truth, shall have any means of truth made effectual to them.

¶ 5. To the difficulty of the following Paragraph, because you propose it by demands, I shall answer by Replys: and to the first, Why the *Arians* were not convinced by that Book, I answer, because 'twas a Book, that is, a multitude of words, which having no Interpreter to protect them, could not preserve themselves from being wrested into senses different from what was meant by the Author. Was there not then, say you, Evidence enough of that truth? Yes, to humble Seekers; but to convince it to the *Arians*, no; Evidence and Conviction (taking them severely) are things above the reach of meer words. But this imputes weakness to S. *John*, or rather the Holy Ghost; why so? put a Reed into a Giants hand, and because with it he cannot cleave an Oak, is he therefore weak? a feeble instrument is no argument of the feebleness of him that uses it: Now words I take to be very weak, and they cease not to be words, whoever he be that employs them; not but that S. *John*, or rather the Holy Ghost by him, which I think, you

you will not deny might have managed them much better, and made a much nearer approach to evidence, had he so pleased, or that been his aym. I see men write plainer every day, and God forbid I should think they understand the use of words better than he that gave them the power to understand. Neither dare I attribute the contrivance of the Book to chance or imagine the works of God to be directed by any thing but his own infinite wisdom and providence. Whence then the obscurity of that book? Truly I am not of Council with the Divinity: but believe I may safely assert thus much, that since the Holy Ghost knew what you would object, and yet chose that manner of writing, he meant you should see that book was not intended for a Judge of differences in Religion, to which he refus'd to give all the qualities necessary for a Judge, and which even a book is capable of.

To this I foresee you will object, that at least S. *John* cannot be excused from the weakness of making choice of a means by which he knew his end was not to be arriv'd at; and that to write against *Cerinthus*

rinthus when he was conscious his writing could not prove his intent, was not only unnecessary, but hurtful. To which I reply, he writ so, as abundantly to prove his intent, in that manner as he design'd to prove it, but his intent was not that his writing should be a proof, contentiously and frowardly scann'd, but humbly and diligently studied. In the former way he had left them a much better weapon both to defend themselves, and overcome their Adversaries, then words can be, namely that which St Paul commands us to desert upon no inducements, no not even of an Angel from Heaven; but besides this, for the superabundant comfort and strength of the faithful, he added also a confirmation of their faith by writing, intelligible enough, at the time, and to the persons he writ, when every body knew what it was which Cerinthus objected, and his followers insisted on, and consequently knew how to apply the Phisick to the disease, and plainly see his pretences overborn by the Apostles authority. But now the case is quite different. To say nothing of the alteration of words and the great change which so much

much time, must needs make, in the Phrases, and manner of speech, our Intelligence of that Heresie is faint and dim, and to expect we should comprehend what was written against it, equally with those ages which flourish'd with it, is to make him, that has hardly any knowledg of the disease, as cunning in the cure, as that Doctor whose charge the Patient is; The Apostles Gospel, therefore, was, in those circumstances, plain enough by the letter, to those to whom he writ, but to us so dark, that except we look upon it with the spectacles of Tradition, or other helps, we have no security of penetrating its sence; though even to them it was not so clear, but that it was wrestible (and much more in the time of *Arius*) to malicious subtlety and wit, which Hereticks never want. But then those Hereticks, not the Scripture, were in fault, say you; and no body doubts but that Heresie and fault are inseparable: But whether they be in fault or no, the Church ought to be furnisht with Arms to defend her self against all sorts of Enemies, and not, till they cease to be in fault (when they will also cease to be

her

her enemies) be left ungarded; she must be provided as well to confound the proud, as confirm the humble: And this first quality is that which we deny to Scripture, and if you onely attribute to it the second, you oppose not us, neither do I know why we should oppose you.

But God has not promis'd that obstinate oppofers of truth, shall have any means of truth made effectual to them. Very true, but he has promis'd the gates of Hell, in which I doubt, these obstinate men cannot be denied to stand, shall not prevail against his Church; and I understand not how they can be denied to have prevailed, if that, which you would make her only guard, uncertain words, being by their craft seduced into a compliance with them, they may as plausibly object obstinacy to the Church, as she to them. For that and constancy are distinguished only by their alliance, or enmity with truth, and if truth cannot be made appear, as you say to obstinate men, God has not promis'd it shall, neither can it, whether be the obstinate opposers, they or the Church. Besides, to hate those inseparable companions of Heresie, Pride,

Obstinacy,

Obſtinacy, conſider what will, in your principles, become of ſincere, but ſharp underſtandings, people that are not yet faithful, nor ever were obſtinate, but always wittie; who look upon diſputes in Religion without concern of any thing, but truth, but look that what themſelves accept for truth, be truly ſuch, and will not be put off with counterfeit ware, and take, inſtead of truth, the partial conſtruction of either ſide. Neither will they be denied, neither can juſtice deny them, but that they ſhould firſt ſee the truth, before they be preſt to imbrace it: Now, that Truth be ſeen to be truth, 'tis plainly neceſſary that there be no poſſibility of falſhood; there being no contradiction in the world more manifeſt then that the ſame thing, ſhould, at the ſame time, be poſſible to be falſe, and evidently true, that is, impoſſible to be falſe.

'Tis equally plain that, where there is nothing to make out the truth, but words, if thoſe words be made agree to two ſenſes, neither can be made out to be truth; for you put but one cauſe, & that producible of both effects. That one may ſomtimes, ſeem the more proper, is nothing to the purpoſe

purpose: For, besides that to offer plausibility to those who look after truth, and can discern it, is to go about to allay hunger with steam in stead of meat, 'tis agreed by all parties, that many times the improper acception is the true one: So by *first-begotten* in *Mat.* 1. we both understand *only begotten*, which nevertheless, are in rigour very different, and 'tis the same of many other and universally of all mystical places.

To apply all to our case, can you deny but that he, who sees the thing may be false, does not see it is true, and consequently that to accept it for truth, is to wrong his nature? Conformably to your Maxime in the 2d Part, That no man must give assent without sufficient evidence? Can you deny, that amongst all the differing Sects of Christians, there is any one which does not, in whatever place of Scripture you urge against them, find a sence favourable to themselves, which they make the words tolerably bear? Can the charity, you claim, suffer you to say, there is no sincerity, no wit, but in your own party, and deny there are amongst the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, *&c.* persons, as sincere as your selves, as desi-

desirous of truth, who search and pray, and yet differ? if none of all this can be denied, consider what a desperately wretched principle it is, according to which there is no effectual means of truth provided, not only for obstinate opposers, but neither for earnest pursuers of it? And since, without the truths we speak of, there is no salvation, and they are not to be had without being seen to be truths, and your principle will not let them be seen, being applicable also to falshood, 'tis a plain case, that according to it these men, that is the most considerable part of mankind, if not in number, at least in value, must be either Infidel, or irrational, either eternally miserable men, or not men in their most important actions, for certainly who acts against reason, is so far not man, but beast.

§ 6. *I thinke* Mr White *p.* 139. *does but beat the air in requiring Gods written Word (if it be to decide) to proceed artificially or scientifically, Let the Almighty have liberty to deliver himself as he please, I think the learnedst and acutest have cause to blesse his Majestie, that he will stoop to meanest capacities (intending his Law for all) that*

so

so the greatest (if the mean may) might more easily understand his oracles and pleasure; that very thing Mr. White thinks wanting in Scripture to the making of it a sufficient Rule to decide, St. Paul glories in, as most suitable to the highness of divine mysteries, which scorn (rather then they will be beholden to) the props of humane wit and invention. 1 Cor. 2. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, &c. *I came not (saith the Apostle) to you with excellencie of speech, or of wisdome, declaring unto you the testimony of God, my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of mans wisdome, but in demonstration of the spirit and power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,* &c. *The demonstration of divine truths was given in plain language, without humane arts, (though St. Paul had them) yet all the Apostles were not so, some being illiterate plain Fishermen; as was their writing, such was their preaching, for we have some part of their discourses penn'd, which were accomodated to vulgar capacities to whom they preached. I ask whether they did not sufficiently demonstrate divine truths to their people in plain language? if not, then they did not leave the Gospel evident enough, if they did, then we have a sufficient*

ficient demonstration of divine truths, although the Bible be not written logically, and its plainnesse hinders it not from being a sufficient Rule to decide or know truths.

¶. 6. I do not find that Mr. *White*, in the place you cite, ties Almighty God to such strict conditions: in saying no more then that writings, penn'd according to the severity of science, are more easily understood, then such as are written loosely without connexion; and I think you deny not. The second [illegible] indeed, out of this, that the Scripture is not written in a method necessary to deliver a judging Law, gathers it was not meant by God for such. But this consequence you do not, and I think the candid Ingenuity you are Master of, will not suffer you to oppose. What you cite from the Apostle I cannot imagin which way you will draw to your assistance. The whole place is expresly of preaching and speech, writing not so much as once glanc'd at, and how Scripture should be proved to be sole Judge of controversies from thence where 'tis not either named or thought of, I professe my sight is too short to discover; your self seem to make

uſe of it againſt your ſelf, when you ſay that if they did ſufficiently demonſtrate divine truths to their people in plain language, then we have ſufficient evidence of them. True, but not by the Bible, for 'twas not by writing but by preaching they taught the people, and 'tis by adhering to what they ſo taught that we alſo, whom perſonally they did not teach, come to have ſufficient evidence of divine tru[illegible]

¶. 7. [illegible]*e that, as* Acts 2. &c. *and* Acts 18. 28. *Apollos mightily convinced the Jews, and that publiquely ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was Chriſt, ſo that Scripture affords ſufficient Arguments, to prove even moſt material points ſufficiently, although obſtinate oppoſers, as the Jews, are not ſilenced, It will be an aggravation to their puniſhment that will not be convinced by Scripture evidence, and I ſee not how it can deſerve puniſhment, if there be not evidence enough to convince.*

¶. 7. What you may urge out of the *Ac*[illegible] know not: what I can find of my ſelf, I am ſure makes nothing againſt me. For the example of *Apollos*, no body doubts, but arguments may be drawn out of

of Scripture with marvellous efficacy. You know the *Dialogues* hold Catholicism may be victoriously evidenc'd to be more conformable to Scripture than Protestancy by arguments purely drawn from the Text, without extrinfical helps: and what they hold may be done againſt you, I conceive was the very thing *Apollos* did againſt the Jews, not that he pretended Scripture was the onely foundation of Faith; The place will not be drawn to any ſuch meaning, and we know our Saviour tells the Jews his works give teſtimony of him, and that they ſhould beleive the works, and not believe him without them; Now I imagine, that to this evidence of miracles when the Jews oppos'd the Authority of Scripture, pretending thoſe could not be the works of God, which juſtified a Doctrine contradictory to the word of God, *Apollos* took away this pretence, by ſhewing his doctrine not onely not contradictory, but much more conformable then theirs, and this I apprehend was the ſence of the Controverſies between them. Now if in this univerſal liberty of prophecying which this age affords us, onely my in-

terpretation do not yet passe for currant, be pleas'd to reflect, no necessity of answering your argument obliges me to rely upon it, to which 'tis enough to say, that no such thing as you intend appears in the place you cite. That the not being convinced, will be an aggravation of punishment to the Jews in this sence, that the pride, and blindness, caus'd by it, which hinders them from coming, by an humble reading, to such a degree of truth, as they might, is a fault for which they shall be punished, I readily grant; but that their punishment shall be aggravated, or they at all punished for not finding a rigorous evidence there where 'tis not, is a fancy in which I cannot perceive any colour of apparence.

¶. 8. *In the* 16. *Encounter* pag. 151. *Mr.* White *answers that* 5th. John, *brought to prove Scripture was sufficient to Salvation without Tradition, why else did God command* Moses *to write those Laws he had given, if that written word was not a perfect Rule, which he commanded to be kept so carefully, and to be read continually*, 31. Deut. 9, 10, 11. *and to be copyed out for the King, as* Deut. 18. 19. *to read therein all the dayes of his life,*

unto

unto which God would have no addition, because it was a perfect Rule, and therefore when the Scribes and Pharisees, would needs bring in their Traditions, as you do, to make void the Law of God, you know what our Saviour denounced against them; Now though we prove the sufficiency even of one Book of Scripture, for to be a sufficient rule to salvation, we are far from contradicting our selves, as though by that reason all the rest (every one of which is profitable) might be burnt: For thus I argue, if one single Gospel be a sufficient rule to salvation, much more are all the Books of the Bible sufficient without your Traditions.

¶ 8. The places which here you cite out of *Deuteronomy* seem little to the purpose: Your premises, That God commanded his Laws to be written, to be kept carefully, and read continually, to be copied out for the King, *&c.* being so vastly distant from the Conclusion, *Viz.* That the written Word was a perfect Rule, that my dulness cannot see any approach between them; all this we see practis'd in our Laws, in which notwithstanding we also see a manifest necessity of an Interpreter: That God would therefore have

no addition, because it was a *perfect Rule*, is a reason for which you are perfectly beholding to your own invention, and which in things of this concern, you would do well not to trust over-far, at least you will pardon an Adversary if he do not.

As for the Scribes and Pharisees, who you say, brought in their Traditions to make void the Law of God, when our cases are alike, I shall think you do us no wrong to rank us with them. But you will be pleased to stay till we do make void the Law of God; for while we confess that the Word, whether written or orally delivered, is the Law, & only enquire after the meaning of the first, which when understood, we profess an intire submission to, I conceive we go not about to make void, but to fulfill the Law; for certainly the wrong sense of the Law is not the Law, and as certainly that cannot be the right sence, which sets the two words, whereof neither can vary from truth, at variance one with another. But to look into the thing, their Traditions have nothing of common with ours but the Word, which will inform you how dangerous a foundation words are, when by the same found

are

are expreſſed things moſt different. Tradition with us ſignifies a publike delivery to a multitude, ſo as what was ſo delivered was ſetled in their underſtanding, and rooted in their hearts by a conſtant viſible practice. Their Tradition was a cloſe underhand conveyance from a few to a few, neither ſo many, nor ſo honeſt, as to be ſecure from miſtakes, both accidental, and wilful, and yet the cheat, if any happned, remaining by the ſecrecy undiſcovered; ſo that nothing more apt to make void the Law of God then ſuch a Tradition as this: Whereas, ſince it cannot be denied, but that what was orally delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles to their Diſciples, and by them practiſed was the Law of God, you muſt either ſay we have violated their practiſe, (which ſince we affirm it to be our rule, you cannot fairly do, without evidencing what you ſay) or you will have much ado your ſelves to avoid the imputation you lay upon us: for evidently the Law is made void, as much by contradicting the unwritten, as the written word; Now if we practiſe what the firſt Diſciples, and their Succeſſors did, and what they practiſed was the Law,

cleerly

clearly he that contradicts our practice cannot refuse the company of the Scribes and Pharisees: So that while by going no farther then the empty sound, you fancie us neer the gulf they were swallowed up in, your judgment, fixed upon the thing, and not diverted by the jugling noise, will find your selves are deep in it.

I cannot leave this Subject without admonishing you of a piece of foul play in the Translation of the Bible, I have heard objected to your side, and which possibly may have had one effect upon your self: 'Tis that Traditions being sometimes commended, sometimes reprehended in the Scripture, though the Original word be the same in both cases, yet the Translation varies it so, as, when it is taken in an ill sence, to render it by the Word *Tradition*; when in a good, always to make use of some other: An Artifice which, if true, argues much want of sincerity in the Translators, and brings much hazard to the Reader; The avoiding of which is the true reason the Church forbids the use of Scripture in Vulgar languages.

For

For the reſt I cannot ſee, but he that ſays, This is ſufficient to ſalvation, ſays, more then this is not neceſſary, and by conſequence, Salvation would not be concerned, if that *more* were not. What you mean by Profitable, I cannot tell: if this that ſome perſons find in ſome books what they would not in others, then evidently thoſe books are neceſſary to thoſe perſons: if onely that their Faith is confirm'd, or ſtrengthned, either this ſtrength is neceſſary to Salvation at leaſt for ſome, and then again the books are neceſſary for them; or unneceſſary, and then what prejudice to Salvation if they were burnt? So that I doubt your fancy was too much poſſeſs'd with the ſound, to give your judgement leiſure to examine the notions of the word. Your conſequence, if one be ſufficient, all are more then ſufficient, is certainly good, but you know we deny, what you muſt next ſubſume, conceiving that neither one, nor all are ſufficient.

¶. 9. *Our Saviour in that* 5th. *of St.* John, *does not Reprehend the Jews* (*as Mr.* White *ſeems to intimate*) *for ſeeking Salvation out of Scripture, where it is to be had,*

but

but tacitely (by that, you think you have it there) implies, they were mistaken, and did presume they had it, who had it not by their own fault for want of conforming to it; David *often tearms the Law of God perfect,* 19. Psa. 7. &c. *the Law of God is perfect converting the Soul, the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: therefore our Saviour sends the Jews to the Scripture (which was sufficient to have taught them, had they been duly qualified with Charity and Humility, else he should have sent refractory Adversaries to an insufficient means in vain) to learn and be convinced of that most material truth, that he was the* Messias. *I observe Mr.* White's *note on the place, Scripture Testimony is put in the last place, not (as he) as the weakest argument, it is not usual to set the weakest, but rather the strongest argument in the last place, therefore the third place does not disparage Scripture; St.* Peter *seems to be of a contrary mind to Mr.* White, 2 Pet. 1. 19. *speaking before of the miraculous voice, subjoynes, we have also a more sure word of Prophesie, &c. Surely St* Austin *is cleerly of this mind, as you may see hereafter, that the written word is a surer Testimonie, than Miracles.*

You

¶. 9. You except here againſt Mr. *Whites* anſwer to the 5*th*. of St. *John*, but wherein conſiſts the force of the exception, and weakneſſe of his anſwer, indeed I cannot comprehend. Our Saviour, ſay you, does not reprehend the Jews, as Mr. *White* ſeems to intimate, but tacitely implies they were miſtaken, &c. But why ſhould not our Saviour reprehend them, whom you acknowledge by their fault and miſtake worthy of reprehenſion? Again what does tacitely implying they were miſtaken, and this by their own fault, differ from, at leaſt, a tacite, that is a ſeeming reprehenſion; ſo that your exception ſeems to conſiſt in ſaying the very ſame thing with him you except againſt. But, what is of more importance, what's all this to the purpoſe? The place is brought to prove Scripture ſufficient, in the way mentioned, to Salvation: All that concerns the queſtion of this place, is that the Jews thought they had life in the Scriptures, but ſo, as you acknowledge, that they were miſtaken and had it not; now let that be the Antecedent, and they muſt be ſtrange Magical Chains, that will tye the Concluſion

to

to it, and make a good argument of this, The Jews had not life in the Scriptures, *ergo* Scriptures are sufficient to Salvation. 'Twas indeed their own fault they had it not, and I doubt not but an humble and charitable diligence would have found in them the important truth our Saviour was insisting on; But to make good the conclusion, 'tis not enough one point may appear to industry and piety, but that all may so appear as to be victoriously maintain'd against obstinate and crafty peevishnesse.

The Attributes of perfection given by *David*, none doubts to be justly due to the Law of God: But what is justly due to it, I conceive injustice to attribute to any thing which is not it. Now Scripture contains, but is not the Law: and as we are far from the Blasphemy of suspecting any imperfection in the Law it self, so the place is as far from any opposition to us; for our question is not of the perfection of the Law, (none but Atheists or Infidels question it,) but of the perfection of the Letter in order to determine Controversies. This we deny, and deny also these places concern our difference. For Mr.

Whites

Whites note, I conceive the place of an Argument too inconsiderable a dispute to take up many thoughts: only this is cleer, that our Saviour, before he mentions Scripture, appeals to the Testimony of *John*, and his Father, and seems to reprehend the Jews for not yielding to them: which argues the consideration of Scripture was brought in more for superabundant condescendence, than necessity. And for St. *Peter*, it would be easie, by explicating the sence of the place, to shew he is far from being of a contrary mind to Mr. *White*: but, it being not proper for an Answerer, to go further than his Opponent leads him, till you expresse where his seeming contrariety lies, give me leave to assure you there seems no such thing to me; and in the mean time to desire your serious reflection on the words next following, that *Scripture is not of private interpretation*, lest while you pretend St. *Peter* contrary to Mr. *White*, your self become contrary to St. *Peter*: S. *Austins* mind, when you make good your promise to shew it me, I promise you shall see mine concerning it.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The two places, 20. *Jo.* and 1. *Luke.* No proof that the written word is a sufficient means for the Salvation of Mankind.

¶. 1. *THe first place of Scripture which Mr. White cannot hinder proving the Scripture a sufficient means for Salvation and Rule to decide all necessary Controversies, is the 20th. chap. and two last verses of the Gospel of St. John, where he gives us an account of his Gospel, I say of his Gospel, and how could he intitle it the Gospel, if it were but a part of the Gospel of Christ; does he delude the world in the very first word and title, to call that the Gospel which is but a little part of it; if there be not all the essential parts of the Doctrine necessary to Salvation, in each of the Evangelists, as St. Mathew, and St. Mark, The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, Mat. 1. 1. It was not his whole business to set down the Genealogie, that's but the 8th. part of the Book, but*

but the Life and Doctrine of our Lord and thus S. Mark *begins,* The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, *and so he goeth on to lay down all the necessary actions and doctrines of salvation; Can you imagin they should set themselves to write half a Gospel,* John 20. *latter end, S* John *confesseth there were many other things done by our Saviour which he had not written, because they were too many to be written, but he hath taken as many of them as are sufficient for us, if we make the right use of them to bring us to salvation.*

¶ 1. You argue next from the word *Gospel,* and pretend the world would be deluded, if all the essential parts of the Doctrine necessary to salvation, were not contained in every one of the Evangelists. But, I beseech you delude not your self into a belief that the word signifies more then it does. I am not Critick enough to derive the English word, which however would prove little more then impertinent labour; but I have been taught the Latin, or rather Greek word *Evangelium,* signifying Originally, no more then good or happy News, or rather the reward given to whosoever

brought such news, is by Ecclesiastical use appropriated to the best and happiest, *Viz.* that of the way to eternal happiness; now I beseech you, cannot a man tell news, except he tell all he know? Or is not that to be called new, which leaves untold any thing belonging to the same subject? To argue therefore, that because S. *John's* Book contains news concerning the way to Heaven, therefore it contains all that concerns our way to Heaven seems very unreasonable; but what is more, 'tis also nothing to the purpose: For were it granted that all things necessary to salvation were contained in every of the Gospels, it would not follow they were so contained as is necessary, that is, accompanied with evidence enough to guide mankind securely through all vicissitudes to happiness, and yet no less is requisite to make Scripture the onely rule of faith.

To the Question you make in the last place, whether the Evangelists can be imagined to have written half a Gospel? I conceive your very next words are an answer; for I beseech you, had S. *John* written those many things which their multitude

multitude made him omit, had they not all been Gospel? So that whatever proportion they bear of ⅓, or ½, or ⅔ to the things written, this is certain, he did not write all the Gospel he knew. Yes, but he writ say you, all necessary to salvation, you say so, but will not take it amiss, if your bare Assertion have not the force to oblige every one to think so, against the plain signification of the word you ground it upon: For necessary to salvation, is not, as I said before, that which the word Gospel imports.

¶. 2. *Mr* White *answers to the place first.* S. John *writing was not to make a compleat History of our Saviours acts and doctrine, but only to specifie such particulars as prove that Christ was the true consubstantial Son of God: to assert is not to prove* S. John *intended only, &c. It may be as easily denied, as affirmed, that like an obstinate Sophister, that intends not truth, but to say somwhat only to stop his adversaries mouth, a sign of a bad cause; It is a sufficient confutation of any new Assertion to prove it but no ground, I see none imaginable Mr* White *builds his Assertion on, unless he has some he does not express;*

which would be strange in this weighty matter, but possibly that Assertion of S. Johns sole intent to prove Christs Diety (without which back door he cannot evade the force of the Argument) is built upon the 31 verse of that 20 Chapter, but these things are written (by me for this intent) that ye might beleeve that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; but if you will give me leave I will prove the contrary with as much probability (and I think certainty) out of the same Text not dis-jointed (as Mr White makes use of it to force a false confession) but taken wholly those things are written (by me for this end) to bring you to salvation by your beleeving or entertainiming the Gospel, that Christ is the Messias, for which end I have given you here those things that are requisite to beget such a saving faith in you, although I might have written more, I have not, contenting my self with those which are sufficient, for what end? 1. To shew you only in a speculative way that Christ is God? No that would not save, but that you may beleeve Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that beleeving you might have life through his name; their having life seems rather to be his chief

end

end because it is in the last place, quod est ultimum in executione est primum in intentione; *or if you will begin at the other end, the words do not shew it* St. Johns *chief design, to prove Christ the Consubstantial Son of God, for thus they run, that ye might believe that Jesus is the* Christ *(or Messias) the Son of God, that is the Saviour of the World, who was to come, that you may be saved by him.*

¶. 2. You next except against the answer Mr. *White* gives to the 20*th* of *John*; and first, that he asserts, but proves not, which you say is a sign of a bad cause, a trick of an obstinate Sophister, &c. But pray recollect your self, and remember an Answerer that goes about to prove, goes beyond his bounds: To affirm, deny, or distinguish, is the whole Sphere of his activity. And when you say, 'tis a sufficient confutation of a new assertion to shew it has no ground; you say very true; but pray take along with you, that your assertion of Scriptures sufficiency to the effect we speak of, is the new assertion, unheard of in the world before *Luther*; and an interpretation of this place in favour of it, every jot as

new

new; no such sence having ever been thought of, till the necessity of justifying an unreasonable Tenet, forced as unreasonable an explication. If you please, prove your ground, and do not take it for granted till it be disproved. When you have done so, shew this, which you call a new assertion of Mr. *White's*, has no ground; for before, sure you ought not to think it, sufficiently confuted. Till then I cannot see why it should be a sign of a bad cause to believe the Apostle, and take his word when he tels us the design of his writing was that we might believe the Divinity of the Son. But you can prove the contrary with as much probabilities out of the same Text: if you do no more, Mr. *White* has done as much as he should do: for if both explications be probable, his Adversary has concluded nothing against him. But you think you can prove it with certainty; let us see whether it be rational for me to think so; and first, after you have quarrelled with Mr. *White* for disjointing the Text, (as I conceive very ungroundedly, when, except this word, *Christ*, which is not any way material, he cites the verse truly

truly) your self, instead of setting it together again, deliver, not the Text, out of which you undertake to conclude, but a large Paraphrase upon it, and this without telling us whether it be your own, or recommended by any authority, or in fine any ground why we should accept it, and, of which, nothing is certain, but that it is not the Text; and This you call certainty. Pray Sir Remember, to assert, is not to prove, Remember it may be as easily deny'd as affirm'd, Remember obstinate Sophistry, and signs of a bad cause.

Next, all the use you make of your Paraphrase is to establish this conclusion, whose certainty too is by this time relented into *seeming*, that their having life seems to be his chief end. Be it so, as I conceive the end of all the Apostles, not only in their writings, but both their and their Masters end, in all his actions was the life of Christians: Sure it will not follow their life needed no other either sustenance or Physick then this Gospel. Be it granted it is a principal means to this end, that it is the only, or whole means, the place does not so much as offer any likelyhood of assertings

nay

nay, I see not how the Apostle can, without manifest violence to the Text, be made, to mean more than the one point he expresses, and the fruit resulting from it; for certainly 'tis not to expound, but wrest a Text, when the same word is repeated in the same period, wilfully to give it one sence in the former, another in the later place; which, yet, is the case here; for in the first part of the period, the word *believe* is so restrained by the Apostle, that it cannot, without unpardonable guilt, be doubted what it was he meant should be believed, when he plainly tells us, 'tis this, that *Jesus* is Christ the Son of God: and the word *believing* presently following, in the same context, and link'd to the former with a conjunction, sincerity cannot imagine it should be meant of any other belief, than that which, so immediately before, was plainly expressed, that to repeat it, had been Tautologie. If words therefore can make any thing clear, I see not what place of doubt there is left, but that this is the Apostles meaning, that the Book was written to the end we might believe the Divinity of the Son, and, by

that

that belief, have life, as much as depends upon that one point; which being the foundation of all our Faith, may perhaps be therefore said to give us life, because whatever contributes to our life, has dependance on it; for if Christ be no Son of God, then no sufficient teacher of mankind, and if no sufficient teacher, then nothing sufficiently taught. Though otherwise, sure life is not promis'd more expresly to this faith, than Salvation to eating his flesh, which nevertheless, I believe you will not say is enough to Salvation, and consequently should not that, this is enough to life.

What you say in the last place, that the words do not shew it St. *Johns* chief design to prove Christ the Consubstantial Son of God, how do you prove? The word *Christ*, which is all the Text has more than what Mr. *White* cites, alters not the case. These two expressions, That *Jesus is the Son of God*, and that *he is Christ the Son of God*, not having any considerable difference, since nothing is more evident, than that he that believes him to be Christ the Son of God, believes him to be the Son of God. But

I

I apprehend all this business to be nothing but the confusion raised in our thoughts, by the equivocation of the word *end*, which may either signifie what S. *John* intended to do when he set himself to write that Book, which I conceive was to shew the Consubstantiality of the Son, or else what fruit he design'd from it after it was written, and this seems to be the life of his Readers.

¶ 3. *They, to whom he wrote, own'd Christ as the Saviour, yet he writes to them, that they might have full knowledge, and a standing monument to preserve that knowledg. But besides that Mr* White *has no ground for that fancie, S.* Johns *design was* only *to specifie such particulars as prove Christs Dietie, I think it an unanswerable Argument to shew from one Chapter another of the Gospel, how many particulars there are, that are nothing at all to this only purpose of* S. John, *yea more particulars that do no way prove it then that doe, as any one may see that reads over the Gospel, I wonder then how Mr* White *could shift off the place by this groundless false Assertion, if it be, as to me it is evident, then* S. John *making here (as it is manifest)*

manifest) a recapitulation of all those Doctrines and Precepts in his Gospel concluding from all, shews us, that his Book is a sufficient rule to salvation in all things absolutely necessary, the expression, that beleeving that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, *must needs be understood as ordinarily it is throughout the Scripture.* He that beleeves shall be saved, *&c. not of a naked assent of the understanding, but of the consent of the will too, as the same* S. John *himself,* c. 1. 12. As many as received him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God *(and now expounding that receiving of Christ for and Saviour, adds)* to them that beleeve in his name? *For this capital truth or Act is big with, or virtually contains all the rest* S. John *had delivered in his Gospel, it were improper for* S. John *being to comprize all in few words, in this Conclusion to particularize all, that were to write over the Gospel again; besides its known* verba intellectus denotant affectus, *else neither this, nor many other expressions of the like nature in Scripture could be true, seeing bare assenting, as Devils do, saves not.*

¶ 3. Whether Mr *White* have any ground for what you call his fancy, I am

ſo confident of your ſinceritie, that I dare appeal to your ſecond thoughts, if you pleaſe toreflect, the word *onely*, which you inſiſt upon, ſeems not more ſeverely uſed by Mr *White* then to ſignifie chiefly, or principally, which may well conſiſt with many, perhaps the greater number of, other particularities; as Sir *Kenelm Digbies* Book was intended ônly to prove the immortality of the Soul, and yet far the greater part is ſpent in the conſideration of bodies. And yet truly I beleeve, that were S. *Johns* Book examined from Chapter to Chapter, little would be found but what does either directly prove our Saviours Divinitie, or is ſubordinate to that end; ſome accidentals excepted, which the nature of ſuch diſcourſes requires ſhould be weaved in, and which hinder not but that the other is the only deſign.

To proceed, I muſt take leave to wonder in my turn, you perſiſt to call Mr *Whites* Anſwer a ſhift, falſe and groundleſs, and ſay no more then you do to make it appear ſo. What you next affirm to be evident and manifeſt, that S. *John* making here a recapitulation of all thoſe Doctrines and and Precepts in his Goſpel, concluding

from

from all, shews us, that his Book is a sufficient Rule to salvation in all things absolutely necessary, if I understand what 'tis to recapitulate, and to conclude, is evidently neither manifest, nor true, for what words are there, that can bear the sense of recapitulating, and concluding in these short periods: Many other things here are which I have not written, but those I have, I writ to the end, *&c.* To recapitulate signifies to sum up the chief Heads of what was said before, and to conclude is to gather something from others that went before, and here are neither heads, nor premises, but a bare Historical Narration informing us what the Apostle did, and why, which differs as much from recapitulating and concluding, as History does from Logick. But, what is of more importance, how came you to be so clear sighted, as where none else can perceive any Conclusion at all, to discover this, That his Book is a sufficient rule to salvation in all things necessary? That belief, or faith is to be understood of saving faith (which is all I can perceive you drive at to the end of the Paraph) is so far from it, that I do not beleeve any violence will

make a premiſe of it; for be it as you deſire that the Apoſtle writ, that we might beleev in Chriſt the Son of God with a ſaving faith, and I dare ſay no Arithmetick would comprehend the number of intermedial links neceſſary to faſten this Concluſion to it, that what he writ is a ſufficient rule to ſalvation.

¶ 4. *But what need I trouble my ſelf or you, with writing all I could, I remember an ingenuous confeſſion of yours, when we were one night diſcourſing of this place that you thought the whole Book was not only ſufficient for ſalvation, but even ſome parts of it, if a man had no more, which is as much as I deſire.*

¶ 4. The anſwer to this Paraph depends upon the memory of that perſon who made ſuch a confeſſion: I conceive it true thus far, that even ſome parts might be ſufficient for the ſalvation of ſome ſingle perſon, extraordinarily diſpoſed, and circumſtanced, which in all likelihood was his meaning. But this is nothing to our Queſtion, whether it be ſufficient for the conduct of all diſpoſitions found in mankind, through all circumſtances the Church will be in from the

the Resurrection to the day of Judgement.

¶ 5. *The second place I look upon as a sufficient proof of Scriptures sufficiency, is the beginning of* S. Lukes *Gospel, compared with the beginning of the Acts. In Mr* Whites *Apology* p. 165, 166. *where he affirms there is not a word that this Book should serve for a Catechism, to teach him and all the world the entire body of Christianity, I think there is, that thou mayest know the certainty of those things thou hast been taught, or as the Greek word is, hast been Catechized in. So then* S. Lukes *Gospel contains a perfect sum of all these Doctrines and duties which* Theophilus *a Christian already had learnt. To me this proves* S. Lukes *Gospel to be a bodie of Divinitie, or a Systeme of all necessary truths of Christianity, so that* S. Lukes *Gospel is more then a naked Historie of Christs life, containing his Doctrine too, or else he had not given* Theophilus *a full account of all he had been instructed in. To say (as* Mr White*) S.* Luke *speaketh but by the by of our Saviours Doctrine, or (as his words are) some of his excellent sayings, is quite contrary to those words of the first of the*

Acts, *out of which he gathers his saying, for there he speaks thus of his Gospel.* The former Treatise have I made, O *Theophilus*, of all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, *which is more then* (as Mr White) *some of his excellent sayings: I lay the stress upon these two words*, all *and* teach, *which* Mr White *passeth over as Commentators do hard places, although it be the chief thing to be answered: Another thing I observe in* Mr Whites *translation, he omits the word* perfectly *or exactly in the third verse of the Gospel, which is very pertinent. By all things Jesus did and taught, must be meant the substance of Christian Religion, the chief Doctrines and duties which were necessary to salvation, for if any material point were omitted by* S. Luke, *he could not alledge his exact knowledge in all things which he promises, nor say as he does in the Acts, that he had delivered all Christ did or taught; from whence I must conclude (and you too, unless you can shew sufficient cause to the contrary) that* S. Lukes *Gospel, much more the whole Bible, hath sufficient truth in it, and contains all points necessary to salvation, and may be a sufficient means, though we have no traditions. The*

Covenant

Covenant between God and man is cleerly enough laid down there, and in other Books besides, with all those things, without which no salvation.

¶ 3. The second place you insist upon is the beginning of Saint *Lukes* Gospel, compar'd with the beginning of the *Acts*: which, with your favour, I conceive you have not brought home to our question; for admit all you say were true, even the conclusion it self, *viz.* that Saint *Lukes* Gospel hath sufficient truths in it, and contains all points necessary to salvation, and may be a sufficient means, though we have no Traditions; your cause is far from being evicted. For our question is not so much whether sufficient truths be contained in scripture, as whether they bee contained sufficiently that is with evidence enough to carry away a cleer victory from malicious and obstinate Criticism: So that it consists very well, that all necessary truths may be contained, which is all you do say, and yet not so contain'd as is necessary for that effect, which is what you should have said. Again, since the same means may be sufficient for one person, which are

are not for another, or for all, and ſufficient at one time, not ſo at another; Your Concluſion that this Goſpel may be a ſufficient means without Tradition, comes far ſhort of what it ſhould be, that 'tis ſufficient to all perſons, in all circumſtances.

Now I preſume the Evangeliſt writing to *Theophilus*, with deſign to inſtruct him particularly, the ſufficiency you ſpeak of, cannot fairly be ſtretched farther then his intent, and be conſtrued to belong to more then *Theophilus* himſelf: And certainly, ſince every body in the Church is not *Theophilus*, to deſerve a Goſpel ſhould be writ to him, it cannot be expected what was ſufficient for him, ſhould be ſufficient for every body elſe. You ſee then how ſtrongly ſoever your Canon is charged, I conceive the Concluſion ſafe, as placed beyond its level. But yet to try the force it has, The firſt thing you ſay againſt Mr *White* is, that you think the place ſhews, the Book was intended for a Catechiſm to teach him, and all the world, the entire body of Chriſtianity, moved by theſe words, *that thou mayeſt know the certainty of theſe things thou haſt been taught or catechized in.* I beſeech

beſeech you, how does it appear, that by *thoſe things* muſt be underſtood a body of Chriſtianity? You ſee Mr *White* underſtands no more by them, then reports he [*Theophilus*] had heard, and tels you, if you will urge another ſenſe, you muſt firſt juſtifie it againſt this. Now evidently writing to let *Theophilus* know the certainty of thoſe reports he had heard, is far enough from writing a body of Chriſtianity. As for the word *Catechized*, which you ſeem to rely upon, its original ſignification, (if good *Grecians* have not miſ-informed me) being moſt properly rendred by *inſono*, or *infundo*, imports no more then a delivery of ſomthing by word of mouth; though ſince, by Eccleſiaſtical cuſtome it hath almoſt been appropriated to the delivery of Chriſtian doctrine.

Now this being ſince S. *Lukes* time, what it was that was ſo delivered to *Theophilus*, cannot be gathered from the word. But if that be true, which you ſay of *Theophilus*, that he was already a Chriſtian, I do not ſee the words can be brought to bear your ſenſe, ſince manifeſtly he could not have been ſo, without already being certain of the body of Chriſtianity. So that your

your Exposition, makes the Evangelist, very wisely, take a great deal of paine, in writing a book, to inform *Theophilus* certainly, of what he certainly knew before. Mr. *Whites* interpretation therefore seems much the more genuine, and yet, even admitting yours, I cannot, as I said before, imagine any approach to our difference: For Sr. *Luke*, expressly confining his design to the instruction of *Theophilus*, hee that extends it to more, acts manifestly without any Warrant from him.

You urge afterwards the first of the *Acts*, which, you say Mr. *White* passeth over as Commentators do hard places. *Truly*, your severity is beyond what I have ever met with, and you are the first example of expecting a man should answer more then is objected: Mr. *White* is speaking to the Gospel, and these words are in the *Acts*, and yet you except against him for taking no notice of them. As for the difficultie it self, since those words cannot be taken in their proper natural signification, St. *John* plainly telling us, the world would not be able to contain the books which might be written; I do not see any ground you

have

have to understand by them the substance of Christian doctrine. With submission to better judgments, I apprehend that by *All* is meant, all he thought fit to communicate to *Theophilus*, that sense seeming to flow naturally from the places compared together: But whether that interpretation be true or no, I am sure nothing appears why a man should accept of yours. For whereas you would prove it out of St. *Lukes* exact knowledge, that is manifestly nothing to the purpose, every bodie seeing it follows not, because S. *Luke* knew all, therefore he delivered all.

And for the quarrel against Mr. *White*, for leaving out the word *exactly*, besides that, as I come from saying, it is far from being very pertinent, exact knowing being much a different thing from exact teaching all he knew, Mr. *White* puts in stead of it, that he was present almost at all things, &c. which, in matters of fact is the most exact knowledg that can be: And for the second proof, that otherwise he could not say he had delivered *All* Christ did or taught, I have already told you, though that word cannot be taken properly, to signifie truly

All

All, you do it wrong to take it so improperly as you do, the substance of Christian doctrine being a strange English of the Latin word *Omne*. But be all this given to the respect of the person, which suffers me not to pass by any thing you say, without taking notice of it, though otherwise your Conclusion, which I am now come to, does not any way prejudice the Tenet I am maintaining; To contain sufficient truths, and to be a sufficient means to salvation, (which may possibly be true in respect of some persons and circumstances) being quite another thing, then to decide all quarrels carried on by factiously litigious persons, and this in all times and cases.

For a conclusion, I beseech you to accept of this observation, that a serious reflection on what you do your self, would satisfie you, whether partie Truth takes in this question; for whatever force, custom, and a prepossest fancie has on your words, to make them maintain St. *Lukes* Gospel alone sufficient, nature contradicts them so powerfully, that your actions speak the clean contrary, and plainly prove 'tis not sufficient: for since you cannot hold, that

a

a sufficient means to you, which you do not sufficiently know to be a means, and this sufficiency of the Gospel you do not know without the Acts, which nature forces you to rely upon, even while you are maintaining you need them not; you see plainly your words and actions agree not, and that while you would by the former perswade the sufficiency of the Gospel alone, the later unresistably convince somthing else, *viz.* the *Acts*, is necessary to its sufficiency, that is, that it alone is not sufficient.

Sect. V.

Answer to those Fathers who are brought for the sufficiencie of Scripture.

MY next Argument for Scriptures sufficiency shall be out of the Fathers, which Mr White *p.* 175. *thinks improper for us, who will not relie on their Authority for any one point; what though we receive not from them any authoritative testimonie, yet we embrace a rational one from any, not*

because they say it, therefore it is true, but because we see no reason to disbelieve, or have sufficient reason to believe they testifie truth, as a Judge collects a truth from Witnesses, every one of which is a fallible man, yet, by beholding circumstances, sees their concurrent Testimonies cannot be false; here we have ground enough to believe, that Scripture was a sufficient rule to them, because they say and confess it was. I am ready to believe any Tradition as well as the Bible, provided we have as good ground to believe it came from the Apostles, as I have of the Bible. Suppose it be not a sufficient argument for us, who besides have Scripture on our side, yet it is a sufficient Argument against you, who pretend to derive your Religion from them who went before you, whom you include in your Church, (as Mr White) If the Bible had once that authority we plead for, in your Church, it should have it still, the contrary being a Novelty; therefore I must count your Doctrine false, till you have solved this Argument. That which was the Rule must be, but Scripture was the Rule, Ergo, &c.

¶. 2. First, I must take out of the way your Objections out of those Fathers I make use

use of, that they were of your opinion, which you gather out of several expressions of theirs, as that of Austin (whose and others their words, I have of late read in your Authors pleading thus your cause) I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority, &c. In which, and all other of their expressions, we must understand (unless we will say through heat of dispute they sometimes contradict their own sence plainly delivered at other times) according to their intent, and so I see not any thing that makes against us, as that mentioned, Elsewhere S. Austin means the Church of all ages, or that present in which he lived: If that precisely, abstractly without consideration of the antiquity of it, and its doctrinal succession from the Apostles, his doctrine had been nothing available against the Manichees, against whom he disputes, for they might have alledg'd the authority of their Church, with as good ground against him, therefore when he alledgeth the authority of the Church or Tradition to be a sufficient proof of that which is not contained in Scripture, he means the universal Tradition of all ages, which was as evident as that of Scripture tradition, or as clearly derived from the

the Apostles by universal Tradition, as the Scripture it self, and such a Tradition I am ready to embrace: It is clear how high he valued the Churches authority in that lib. 2. de util. cred. c. 14. *This therefore I believed by fame, strengthned by celebrity, consent, antiquity, so that he did no more than we, who notwithstanding are of a contrary mind to you.*

¶ 3. *First we believe the things of Religion, because they are published and held in that Church or place where we live, yet not sufficiently, for that, not a sufficient ground of belief, because of fame, till the universal celebrity, consent and antiquity, do strengthen it. He sees not Christ hath recommended the Church for an infallible decider of emergent controversies, but for a credible witness of ancient Traditions; whosoever therefore refuseth to follow the practice of the Church (understand of all places and ages) in things clearly descended from Christ, let him be looke upon to refuse Christ; But if he be understood any where asserting only the present Churches authority sufficient to determine, it must be in things that are not matters of faith, that which he proves by tradition, he does not affirm it ne-*

cessary

cessary to salvation, or things contained in Scripture, for his (Austins) words are evident.

§. 4. In iis quæ apertè posita sunt in sacris scripturis omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi, *Aug. de doct. Christiana, lib. 2. c. 9.* Nemo mihi dicat, O quid dexit Donatus, aut quid dexit Parm. aut Pontus, aut quilibet eorum? quia non Catholicis Episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte fallantur, ut contra Canonicas Scripturas aliquid sentiant. *Aug. de unitate Eccl. c. 10.* *Again,* Ecclesiam suam demonstrarent si possunt non in sermonibus & rumoribus Afrorum, non in conciliis Episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet disputatorum, non in signis & prodigiis fallacibus (quia etiam contra ista verbo Domini cauti redditi sumus) sed in scripto legis, in prophetarū prædictis in cantibus Psalmorum, in ipsius Pastoris vocibus, in Evangelistarum prædicationibus & laboribus; hoc est in omnibus Canonicis Sanctorum librorum authoritatibus, *Eodem lib. c. 16.* Utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, non nisi divinarum Scripturarum Canonicis libris ostendant; quia nec nos propterea dicimus credi-

credi debere, quod in Ecclesia Christi sumus; aut quia ipsam commendavit Optatus Ambrosius vel alii innumerabiles nostræ communionis Episcopi; aut quia nostrorum collegarum conciliis prædicata est, aut quia per totum orbem tanta mirabilia Sanctorum fiunt, *&c.* Quæcunque talia in Catholicâ fiunt ideo approbantur, quia in Catholica fiunt, non ideo manifestatur Catholica, quia hæc in ea fiunt. Ipse Dominus Jesus cum resurrexit a mortuis, & discipulorum oculis corpus suum offerret, ne quid tamen fallaciæ se pati arbitrarentur, magis eos testimoniis legis & Prophetarum & Psalmorum conformandos esse judicavit. *Ibidem.* Non audiamus hæc dico, sed hæc dixit Dominus. Sunt certæ libri Dominici quorum auctoritati utrique consentimus, ibi quæramus Ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram, *Eod. lib. c.* 23. *Chrysost. in Act. Hom.* 33. *Take from Heretick the Opinions which they maintain with the Heathen, that they may defend their Questions by Scripture alone, and they cannot stand.* Tertullian de Resurrectione carnis. Hierom *on* Matth. 23. *writing of an Opinion that* John Baptist *was killed, because he foretold*

told the coming of Christ, saith thus; this, because it hath no authority from Scripture, may as easily be condemned as approved. I might here add Aquinas his words, 1ª quæst. 36. art. 2. ad 1um. confessing what he had prayed out of Dionisius, We are to affirm nothing of the Holy Ghost, but what we find in Scripture. Thus you will have Scripture alone (some of you as Mr White confesses) to be the Rule for some truths, though not for others, which indeed are humane invitions; but I shall not urge you to maintain all your Doctors affirm (which notwithstanding, you who build upon authority, have more cause to do then we) Only observe the Fathers were against you. I proceed to give you more proofs of it.

¶ 1, 2, 3, 4. I come now to your Testimonies from the Fathers, and beg leave before I enter upon them to pause a while upon the State of the Question betwixt us, that our eye being strongly fixt upon it, may not be diverted by that variety of Objects, which the many notions found in Testimonies will present it. You assert, We deny *Scripture* to be the *rule* of *Faith*; Every of which words deserves its particular reflexion. For first, by *Scripture*

is.

is meant either the words or sense; that is, the words containing a sense, so as that another may be found in the same words; or else a sense expressed accidentally by such words, & which might have been expressed by other. By a *Rule* since 'tis our belief must be regulated, and our belief is of things, not sounds, is understood either a determinate sense, or certain means to arrive at it. We say then that Scripture, taken the first way cannot be a Rule, nothing being more evident then that words, meerly as such, without dub qualifications, which are not found in all words, are neither sense, nor means to arrive at a determinate one, since the same words may comprehend many senses. Take *Scripture* the second way, and the question is quite changed; none denies the sence of it to be the word of God, by which all our belief and actions are to be regulated, our Dispute then in that case, is not whether it be a Rule, but how 'tis known, whether by the bare words in which 'tis couched (which we deny, because other senses are couched in the very same words) or by the Churches authority interpreting it by Tradition, which

you

you conceived unneceſſary. To Scripture interpreted by Tradition, or the ſence of Scripture acknowledged by Tradition, we ſubmit all our thoughts and actions, but deny the title of a Rule can belong to Scripture, taken for the meer words, unſenſed characters, and conceive the ſence of Scripture cannot be ſufficiently diſcovered by the bare ſcanning of the words, which after all, being capable of many ſences, leave it undetermined which is the true one.

Faith is to be conſidered either in reſpect of one, or ſome few men, or in reſpect of a multitude; for ſince the ſame cauſe produces not the ſame effect upon different ſubjects, 'tis not poſſible that to every of thoſe many, who are comprehended in a Church, the ſame knowledge ſhould be neceſſary: That there is a rewarder of good, and puniſher of evil, may for ought I can tell be enough for ſome extraordinarily diſpoſed creature to know; but mankind requires the knowledge of much more. Again outward circumſtances extremely vary the diſpoſition of the ſubject. We live both in calms and ſtorms, and to day a waſhing boul will ſerry me

over

over the *Thames*, which Oats perhaps will hardly do to morrow: Now since he that meets with no rubs seldom stumbles, if the way be smooth and even, every thing overcome in, if rugged or deep, 'tis not passed without much labour and difficulty. And so the faithful who live in a deep peace, need not that strength of certainty, which is necessary for those, who are assaulted by the outward wars of Heresie, or intestine broils of Schism.

Observe then, if you please, what your witnesses to gain your cause, should depose for you. That Scripture, taken for the words, teaches the Church, that is, mankind the way to salvation, so as not to need the assistance of Tradition, or any other Interpreter, to secure them against all possible assaults of all possible adversaries; or taken for the sence, that the sence of Scripture is so known by the bare words, without the help of Tradition, or other Interpreter, that no subtlety or malice can weaken the certainty it gives of as much as is necessary for the salvation of mankind. This is what they should say, What they do, let us now examine. But first you tell us, you receive not

not their Testimony as *authoritative*, but embrace both their and any other as *rational*, which is a peece of learning, I should have been not sorry to have met in an Adversary I had desired to treat like one. To you I can only say, your difference to those, who mint such adulterate coin, is much greater then the blind obedience with which we use to be reproached.

Of the two ways of moving assent, *Authority* & *Reason*, the one is distinguished from the other in this, that the first relies upon the credit of the Proposer, whom, if we be satisfied he is so wise as to know what he says, and so good, as not to say against what he knows, 'tis rational to believe, and lay hold upon the truth he presents us, which we see, with his eyes, not our own. The second carries us, by the evidence of truth it proposes, barefaced, and without any consideration of the Proposer, in which way we rely upon our own eyes, not another mans credit: Wherefore if you will proceed the first way, by Testimonies, they are onely, and so far valuable as their Author has authority, and must be either authoritative, or

of

of no force at all: If the second, 'tis impertinent to cite an Author for what is considerable, onely in respect of what it is, not in respect of him that said it, for reasons have weight from their inward vertue, and are neither greater in the mouth of *Aristotle*, nor lesse in the mouth a Cobler. Neither therefore can *authoritative* be separated from *testimony*, nor *rational* joyned to it; a rational Testimony in true English, saying a Testimony, which is not a Testimony, but a reason.

Your 3 Paragh too has a very pretty distinction in these terms, that the Church is is no infallible decider; but a credible witness, whereas these two, are at least in our subject matter inseparable. For since not infallible says fallible, and fallible says that which may deceive, and credible says what 'tis rational to beleeve, and nothing is more irrational then to beleeve what may deceive the beleever, plainly if the Church be not infallible, neither is she credible. Besides, her power of deciding in things of this nature, is founded upon her power of witnessing, she being therefore able to decide, because she is able to witness what it was which Christ

and

and her Apostles taught her, and she has till now preserved; in which, if she can credibly, that is, infallibly witness, she can also infallibly decide, if her testimony be fallible, she cannot be credible. The rest of what you say, till you come to the Testimonies themselves, although I do not allow, yet I think not necessary to meddle with, apprehending the concern of our dispute to be very independent of it. But now S. *Austin* tells us, *non Catholicis Episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte fallantur, ut contra Canonicas Scripturas aliquid sentiant.* Very true, and sure no body, at least no Catholick Bishop ever pretended to be believed against Scripture, that is, its sence, concerning which, our contest is how tis known, and to that the witness says nothing. Again, *Ecclesiam suam demonstrent non in sermonibus, &c. sed in Canonicis librorum authoritatibus*: And, *utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant non nisi divinarum Scripturarum Canonicis libris ostendant*: Lastly, *non Audiamus hæc dico, sed hæc dixit Dominus, &c. ibi quærimus Ecclesiam, &c.* In which three places he challenges his Adversaries, to prove their cause by Scripture, a course, not onely commendable in him,

but practis'd dayly by us. Several of our Books will witness for us, we are so far from thinking our cause lost by Scripture, that we know it infinitely superior even in that kind of tryal: but what's this to the purpose? Because St. *Austin* then, and we now, know the advantage Scripture gives us above all our Adversaries, does therefore either he or we think the bare words of it are our Rule of faith, or that its sence needs no other means to be found out, but the bare words? These Sir are our onely Questions, but not so much as thought on by the Judges you bring to decide them. The place you bring from his *Doct. Christ.* seems more to the purpose, but yet comes not home; it being violence to extend it farther then private Readers, and these qualifi'd, as he expresses, with piety, humility, and fear of God: *pietate mansuetis*, (as his words are) *de timentibus Deum*, piously meek, and fearing God. And of these tis also Mr. *Whites* opinion, that the Scripture is plain enough to make them perfect beleeving Catholicks. But that 'tis able to consist with captious frowardness, and those crooked dispositions which

which accompany Heresie, or satisfie the nice sharpness of sincere, but piercing wits, or that the plainness, he speaks of, ought to bee understood with respect to the exigencies of the Church, that is mankind, which may be true in respect of such excellently dispos'd persons as he mentions, are things, however necessary, yet not at all touched.

St. *Hieroms* authority is wider; all it says being thus much, that where there is but one authentick History extant of the Subject to be spoken of, what is not found there, has no sufficient ground to keep it from being unblamably rejected. Which is his case: for there is no authentick History of the actions of St. *John Baptist*, but the Bible; wherefore, since they are no subject of Traditions, they must either deny their ground from thence, or have no ground at all.

Tertullians words are plainly changed: for whereas you make him tye, and, as it were, challenge Hereticks to defend their cause by Scripture, his words are; *ut de Scripturis solis questiones suas sistant*, That they may, not *defend*, but *present*, or *handle their Questions*, not by, but of *Scrip-*

places alone, in which, though by the oddness of the Phrase, the sence be a little dark, yet this is clear, that the expression is common to *proving* and *defending*, and therefore to restrain it to *defending*, is in the mildest language, manifest injustice: For my part, I conceive the sence no more but this; That Hereticks cannot prove their cause by Scripture. But I must wonder at the proceedings of your men, and by what charm they get the credit of misleading people, when 'tis manifest they chuse to grope in the dark, when they might walk in the open light. To hook in the authority of *Tertullian* to their party, they take advantage here of a place, whose obscurity renders the sence hard to be determined, and easie to be wrested (but not enough to their purpose neither, without plainly changing the words) when they cannot be ignorant he has delivered his judgement directly against them in as expres terms as words can frame in his *prescription against Hereties*. I shall only transcribe two short places, and recommend the whole excellent Work to your serious perusal. He tells us we are not to dispute with Hereticks

ticks out of Scripture, which they have nothing to do withal, it being forbid by the Apostle amongst other Reasons, *Quoniam nihil proficiat congressio scripturarum, nisi plane ut aut stomachi quis ineat eversionem aut cerebri*; because *handying of Scriptures is good for nothing at all, but to turn either the stomack or the brain*: And a little further, *Ergo non ad Scripturas provocandum est, in quibus aut nulla, aut incerta victoria est, aut parum certa: Wherefore we are not to appeal to Scriptures, in which the victorieds either none at all, or uncertain, at least not certain.*

Now I beseech you, where is the sincerity of those men who would make us beleeve *Tertullian* held Scripture the only rule of Faith? Or because there is a wrestible place to be found in one of his Books, 'tis his judgement of the point in question, either doubtful, or possible to be unknown to whoever desires to know it, and much lesse to any that lays claim to the title of learned? S. *Thomas* of *Aquine* says indeed, that nothing is to be affirmed of God, which is not expressed in Scripture; but how? either according to the words, or according to the sence:

which is to say, that some things, as in particular the question in hand of the Holy Ghost are so in Scripture as not to be efficaciously discovered by the words; and so he brings a place to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, very far from unavoidable. But I forbear to urge his authority against you, imagining by your nice wariness in mentioning him, you are sufficiently satisfied he is far from your opinion in this point, and proceed to the rest of the proofs you give a promise of.

¶ 5. *It appears Christian people look'd upon the Bible, as the rule of Faith, by these words of the Council in* Socrates *his Ecclesiastical History*, 2. l. c. 29. Nomen substantiæ quoniam a patribus simpliciter positum a populo autem ignoratum, offensionem propterea multis concitat (*mark*) quod Scripturis minimè sit comprehensum [*they would not have been offended if the Scripture had not been their Rule*] visum est ipsum tollere, & omnino nullam mentionem hujus verbi substantia, cum de Deo loquimur, de reliquo fieri quia literæ sacræ omnino substantiæ vel Filii & Spiritus Sancti neutiquam meminerint

nerint

nerint filium tamen Patri per omnia similem dicimus: quippe cum sacræ Scripturæ illud asserant, doceant. *And that expression of* Constantine *to which all the Bishops (except those friends of* Arius*) did consent when he came first into the Council of* Nice, *after the Bishops had taken their places exhorting them to concord*: A quo (Eustachia) cum esset peroratum, Imperator omni genere laudis illustrissimus, verba facere de concordia & consensu animorum in memoriam eos redigere tum crudelitatis tyrannorum, tum præclarissimæ pacis suis temporibus divinitus Ecclesiæ decretæ.

Ostendere etiam, quam grave esset, imo vero quam acerbum hostibus jam profligatis, & nemine ex adverso se opponere audente, ut ipsi se oppugnarent mutuo, & lætitiam inimicis, atque adeo risum præbereat; præsertim cum de rebus divinis disputarent, haberentq; doctrinam sacratissimi spiritus literarum monumentis proditam. Nam libri (inquit) Evangelistarum & Apostolorum, quin etiam veterum prophetarum oracula nos evidenter docent, quid de divino numine sentiendum sit. Omni igitur seditio-

contentione depulsa, literarum divinitus inspiratarum testimoniis res in quæstionem adductas dissolvamus: *Theodoret* Eccles. History, l. 1. cap. 7.

Many more expressions I might bring, but I do not see what can be clearer, then these words or what sence possibly you can put upon them, the Emperor seems to exaggerate it as a most unreasonable and strange thing that they should dissent in matters of Faith, while they have them evidently laid down in Scripture, which he bids them take for their rule to decide the controversie by, and accordingly the Author tells us they did, and in their leters and forms of Faith; I find all along Scripture Arguments. I think this deserves your serious consideration.

¶ 6. *I think your own Reason (if you will impartially give it leave to act and declare it self) will tell you this clear Argument deserves a clear answer, not a conjecture without ground, as* Mr. White's p. 93. &c. *will appear to any unbiassed man. We have ground* (says he, *and yet does not give any ground, which therefore is as easily denied as asserted*) *to believe that some learned men in the Court, were prevailed by*

Arius,

Arius, and solicited into a secret favour of this error, from whom 'tis likely (it is not likely) proceeded that motion of Constantine to the Council, for determining the point out of Scripture. Did not Constantine know the truth before? Mr White proves he did by his own Argument 97. unless a man be so perverse as to affirm Christians did not use the form of Baptism prescribed by Christ, there can be no doubt of the blessed Trinity: the very words of Baptism carrying the truth (I say) in themselves: and is that likely the Emperor would betray the truth, or favour an Heretick to whom he writes sharply, and of whom he speaks bitterly in his letter to the Church of Alexandria, against whom chiefly he had even called the Council. Mr White confesseth the Council followed the Emperors words, and there was magna conquisitio, turning of Scriptures, &c. though not to that end to which the Emperor propos'd it; so then he grants the Emperor propos'd it, as I make use of his words. But the Council did not follow his words for that end; the historian says, Maxima pars ejus verbis obtemperavit. I cannot gather one syllable hence nor from any other place for Mr White.

White; Unless there be a proof, it is but Sophistry, and a sign of a desperate cause. It is likely, is it not? that grave wise Assembly that came to confute an obstinate adversarie, would make use of a Lesbian rule (if they did not count it sufficient and the chief) which their Adversary would make nothing of, as long as one place can explicate a hundred opposed, so Mr. White speaks.

¶. 7. Yet it is plain they did make use of this Rule, and did conclude by it, (that same truth which they had before that learnt out of it, as Eusebius in his Epistle to his own people confesses. Socr. l. 1. c. 5. yea, stick and keep to Scripture-expressions, in the forme of their determinations, as much as they could, which Mr. White himself calls a good way to govern their expressions by: and therefore I cannot imagine the possibility of the truth of his words, (p. 98.) that the Council at last was forced to conclude out of Tradition, he brings Theodoret to prove it, but names not the place where, I have read all I can imagine should serve it, but finde not one word: a mistake, I say it be, which the Rules of Saint Irenæus, &c. justifies; I have not the other

he

he mentions, without citing the place; as for Irenæus, I am sure it is false, he has no such Rule in his whole book, the only place in him that glauceth at it, is not a proof (I speak of it elsewhere) if it were, it would prove Irenæus an egregious fool, to spend above 600 pages to no purpose in Scripture-Argument, and then in one page do all the work by your imaginarie only Argument, I expect a better Solution, or a deserved consent to the contrary truth.

¶. 8. *Mr.* White p. 95. seems to make the Bishops to set upon this Resolution of their own accord; if that be true also, then both Bishops and People were of the same minde his words are; But the same Bishops consented to excommunicate the Contradictors, to hinder men from unwritten words: and was not that a proper and prudent remedy to prevent the inconveniences that easily arise from confusion and incertainties of language: when every one phrases the mysterie according to his private fancie (and are not all your Traditions, which you say depend not upon words subject to these inconveniences, pray tell me ingenuously) and governs not his terms, by some constant and steadie Rule, and the Writings of the Apostles or ancient Fathers. What

now!

now! does Mr. White *turn his tale, and call Scripture a constant steadie rule, which before he made a nose of wax.*

¶ 5, 6, 7, 8. Here follows a Citation from a Council out of *Socrates*, which to a Person disposed to make use of it affords a fair advantage: But as my aim is your service, not victory, I shall only desire you to reflect they were Hereticks, who by the Artifice of that pretence, sought to draw the Council of *Ariminum* to subscribe a new form of Faith, in prejudice of what had formerly been establisht at *Nice*: A sleight which the Catholicks rejected with this Answer: We came not hither as though we wanted Faith and belief (for we retain that Faith which we have learned from the beginning) but we are come to withstand Novelties; if those things which you have now read, neither favour, nor tend to the establishing of Novelty, accurse and renounce the Heresie of *Arius* in such wise as the old and ancient Canon of the Church hath banished all Heretical and Blasphemous Doctrine. Now consider, if you please, who they were that pretended Scripture, who they that rejected it, and adhered

constantly

constantly to what they had learned from the beginning, and observe which party your Position takes, and which mine.

Next, is an expression of *Constantines* in his Oration to the Council of *Nice*, insisted upon, to my no small wonder, through 4. Paragraphs. For how comes it that a man bred up wholly to the Arts of War and Government, and so lately become a Christian, that he wanted even time, had his other employments been no Obstacle, to advance beyond the degree of a Learner, should yet be look'd upon by you as so great a Doctor, that an expression of his (which according to the custom of such persons too, has more of oratory, then severe discourse in it,) should wholly sway you in a point of Religion, whose judgment I dare say, in a point of Politicks, in which he was much better vers'd, would not be of half that credit with you? what if he did not so much as understand the thing? and if he did, what if he spoke rather according to his occasions then his judgment? For Princes you know, do, and ought to govern their actions by other rules then private men, and speak sometimes more what 'tis fit

they ſhould be heard ſpeak, then what they truly think. In either of theſe caſes, both which I take to be, not only poſſible, but ſo far probable that I think them true, how weak a ſupport is this Teſtimony you ſo much rely upon? And yet I think theſe advantages ſo unneceſſary, that the place it ſelf faithfully conſulted needs no aſſiſtance to conclude plainly againſt you; For ſince you make *Conſtantine* ſatisfied of the truth of the Queſtion, before the calling of the Council, it cannot with any colour be imagined he meant to put that to tryal which, before the tryall appointed, was already known, and reſolv'd on. The Queſtion therefore in Iſſue, could not be which was Faith, which Hereſie, neither does that uſe to be, or indeed can be a Queſtion among thoſe that know their own Faith: but how the oppoſitions made againſt the known Faith might be anſwered. And this (beſides that after a man is ſatisfied of the truth of one part of the Queſtion, there can be no more diſpute concerning the ſame Queſtion, but how to anſwer the Objections of the oppoſite) is clear from the very words: For *diſſolvere* does not ſignifie

signifie to give sentence in a Question, (he that should English it so, would wrest it strangely) but to solve an Argument, its natural signification, to loose or untie, being applied by Schollers to the knots of Sophistry. That Phrase therefore imports the answering an Objection, not the determining a controversie, and the sence of the place is this: Let us by Scripture shew the Arguments of *Arius* brought out of Scripture fallacious and unconcluding.

I beseech you then to accept of this short Answer to your long Discourse; First, that whatever were *Constantines* opinion, 'tis of no extraordinary importance either way, he being a man wholly bred up to other Arts then Divinity, and by the course of his life disabled from attaining a mastery in such abstruse points. Secondly, that yours is so far from appearing to be his Opinion, that you cannot force it upon the words you cite without manifest violence, and which their own genuine signification, and the consideration of circumstances plainly refuse.

As for that part of your seventh Para-

raph, where you deny the Council was forced to conclude out of Tradition, the desire of serving you makes me wish my self a better Historian then I am : But I think the Epistle of S. *Athanasius* to the *Africans*, which you will find in *Theodoret lib. 1. c.* 8. will sufficiently clear that Truth to you, since 'twill inform you, that whatever words the Fathers of the Council could chuse out of Scripture to express the Catholick Faith in, the *Arians* knew how to elude, by shewing the same words to have other sences in other places; which at last forced the Fathers to invent a new word, and gave occasion to the *Arians* of murmuring, that they were condemned by unwritten words; that is, not by Scripture, but by Tradition.

Since, what has formerly been said, will I hope, be an ingenuous Answer to the question of your eighth Paraph, and satisfie you that Tradition is not subject to the same inconveniences with words; there remains no more but to vindicate Mr *White* from the inconstancy you charge him with, to which there will I think no more be needful, then barely to represent

represent the case to your second thoughts: Our faith, you know, must be both beleeved and expressed; the expressions, he conceives it fit, should be uniform, and that the best way in order to it, is to make use, as much as may be, of those which the Holy Ghost in Scripture has before made use of. But since expression supposes the knowledg of what it is we would express, he holds there is some other way to come to this knowledg besides looking upon the expressions which are consequent to the knowledg, whereas the way to it is before it, and that the expressions naked of themselves, and left unguarded of other helps are not sufficient to preserve and secure the truths they contain; the Positions then are both true, That the Scripture is the best Rule to govern our expressions by, and yet not sufficient to regulate our Beleef; and the contradictions you fancy between them, proceeds not from his inconstancy, but your inadvertence.

¶ 9. *Of late I have read over* Iræneus, *diligently endeavouring to see the Rule he takes for to confute the Errors he writes against, and cannot see but you are out:*

One or two places indeed I have found seeming to favour you, which since I find your Writers make use of, yet if I understand any thing he is your enemie. He says indeed in his fifth Book, cap. 4. What if the Apostles had not left us Scriptures, ought we not to have followed the order of Tradition which they delivered, &c. But does not this imply, we need not use crutches, seeing we have legs; some Nations he says had no written Word, yet had the same Doctrine which was written: What then? As long as they have and retain the Doctrine purely, whether in writing or in their hearts, it is well, but though the Apostles did leave some Nations the Gospel without Writing, it does not follow that they would have always retained and kept it in succeeding ages purely; where is there any particular Church under heaven, that hath to this day kept the doctrines of salvation from the Apostles entirely without any writing? He might challenge his Adversaries to shew their doctrine came from the Apostles by Tradition, living presently after those times wherein some that conversed with the Apostles lived, and when all Churches agreed (as in Irænæus his time) in matters of Faith, and that

uniformly

unity was then a good assurance, they all came from one fountain; but the case is altred, those ancient Churches afterwards were divided, and then whom must a man beleeve, when each say they have the way to heaven?

¶ 9. I am sorry your opinion and mine disagree so much about *Irenæus*, whom though I cannot profess to have read so exactly as you do, yet I dare say I am not mistaken, as I think you are, in the sence of those places I have read: And first, the edge of those two, you bring in our behalf, seems not at all taken off by the Answers you give them. For since in case no Scriptures had been left, he refers us to the order of Tradition, plainly supposing Tradition would have done our business, and that we had not, even in that case been left without a rule (it had been non-sence to refer us to a rule, which would not have been a rule when tryed, and had he thought so, he would certainly have told us, there had been in that case no rule at all) and if so, then pray why is not Tradition as much a rule with Scriptures as without them? They may add to its force by their testimony, but take away

away nothing of its efficacy. For, that the truths, which the Apoſtles taught, were written, ſure makes them no whit the leſſe truths, and if it may be known what 'twas they taught (as you ſee *Irenæus* is of the opinion it may by Tradition) I hope the ſecurity is equal whether it were or were not commended to writing. This place then (which by the way is not in the fifth but third Book) makes it very evident *Irenæus* held another rule beſides Scripture, that is Scripture not the onely Rule, which is your Tenet.

Again, ſince ſome Nations had the Doctrine, but had no Scriptures, does it not follow undeniably that there was another means beſides Scripture to preſerve the Doctrine amongſt them? and further that the Apoſtles truſted not to writing the preſervation of the Doctrine they taught them? which had they intended for a means, much more the only means of doing it, they cannot be imagined to have omitted. I learn therſore from this place, both the efficacy of Tradition, which actually did preſerve the Apoſtles doctrine without writing, and the judgment of the Apoſtles, who left their

doctrine

doctrine in these Nations not to Scripture, but Tradition, to be preserved. But it follows not, say you, they would have retained their doctrine pure in succeeding ages, although they did so till *Irenæus*'s time. And pray why does it not follow? provided they would still make use of the means by which they retain'd pure doctrine till that time: and what time shall be assigned in which the same cause shall leave off producing the same effect? since confessedly tradition did preserve the Doctrine till then, you should prove, not barely affirm, it could do so no longer. But the truth is, and your own clear thoughts will certainly shew it you, that rule was so far from a likelihood of betraying the truths committed to her, that it cannot be contrived into a possibility that it should betray them; for since the Apostles left them the truth, as long as they retained what they received from the Apostles, and admitted nothing else, which is the method of Tradition, pray what door could Error find to creep in at? 'Twas not therefore possible for them to make shipwrack of their faith, till they had first thrown

thrown their rule overboard, and they would not only have preserved their doctrine pure to succeeding Ages, by the same means they had preserv'd it till then, but they could not preserve it pure, while they retain'd the same means which had preserv'd it till then.

To the following question I answer, the Church, of which by Gods mercie I am a member, has preserved the doctrines of salvation entire, not without writings indeed, but without making them her Rule to preserve them by, neither had she, or could she have preserved them, had there been no other means left her then words. For what you say next, I refer you to the *third Dialogue*, to see, since 'tis the same thing in point of certaintie, to receive a truth immediately, through two hands, or through twentie, provided we be sure there be no deceit in the intermediate Conveyers, all possibilitie of deceit removed from them, and consequently our certaintie equal with that of those who lived nearer the Apostles times. As for the unity of the Churches in the time of *Irenæus*, 'tis true there was an unity, and still is amongst all those that

that stuck to Tradition, but then, as now, some were divided, and by the same means as now, *viz.* by preferring their private Interpretations of Scripture before the doctrine they had been taught. This divided the *Valentinians* in the time of *Irenæus*, the *Arians* in the time of St. *Athanasius*, the *Donatists* in Saint *Austins*, in all Ages some, and divides you now. And the way to know whom a man must believe, when each say they have the way to Heaven, was then, as now, to keep fast to what had been taught, to follow those Churches that do so, and those that build upon private Interpretations to reject; so that the case is not at all altered, the method of arriving to the knowledge of saving truths, being the same anciently and now.

¶. 10. *That* Irenæus *apprehended all those truths necessary for salvation, were contained in Scripture, which some places for a while have had without writing, is clear by what follows, and that the Scripture is a sufficient rule to salvation, and was to him and the Church in his days which enjoyed it: he tells us, the Apostles left the same in writing, in* lib. 3. cap. 1. edit. Basil. *His words*

words are, Non enim per alios depositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos. Quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. *Is not this clear against you? The Scripture then was not written by chance, but by the Will of God, for this end, that it might be a standing rule, and pillar or foundation of our faith. And* lib. 2. cap. 46. *shews this is a clear certain way for every one,* Cum itaque universæ Scripturæ & propheticæ, & Evangelicæ, in aperto & sine ambiguitate, & similiter ab omnibus audiri possunt, *He was blaming Hereticks drawing errors from obscure Places and Parables, when they might have seen the light in clear places, by which the darker are to be understood. God (says he) has given power to honest religious mindes that are desirous of truth to see it,* Hæc promptè meditabitur & in ipsis proficiat diuturno studio, facilem sententiam efficiens. Sunt autem hæc, quæ ante oculos nostros occurrunt, & quæcunque apertè, & sine ambiguo ipsis dictionibus posita sunt in Scripturis, &

ideo

ideo Parabolæ debent ambiguis adaptari; sic enim & qui absolvit, sine periculo absolvit, & parabolæ ab omnibus similiter absolutionem accipient, & a veritate corpus integrum, & simili adaptatione membrorum, & sine concussione perseverat. Sed quæ non apertè dicta sunt, neque ante oculos posita, copulare absolutionibus parabolarum, quas unusquisque prout vult adinvenit, sic enim apud nullum erit regula veritatis. *And so says he there, (If we do not with sober unbiass minds take the plain Scripture for our guide) a man shall be always seeking, but never come to the truth, yet the Scripture doth clear it, though all do not believe one God, &c.* sicut demonstravimus ex ipsis Scripturarum dictionibus. Quia enim de cogitatione eorum qui contraria opinantur de patre, nihil apertè, neque ipsa dictione, neque sine controversiâ in nullâ omnino dictum sit Scripturâ, & ipsi testantur dicentes, in absconso hæc eadem Salvatorem docuisse non omnes, sed aliquos discipulorum, qui possunt capere, *&c.* Quia autem Parabolæ possunt recipere multas absolutiones, ex ipsis de inquisitione Dei affirmare, derelinquentes quod cer-

tum & indubitatum & verum est, valde præcipitantium se in periculum, & irrationabilium esse, quis non amantium veritatem confitebitur. *And in the next Chapter*, Habentes itaque regulam ipsam veritatem, & in apertum positum de Deo testimonium, non debemus quæstionum declinamees in alias atque alias absolutiones ejicere firmam & veram de Deo scientiam, &c. Si autem omnium quæ in scripturis requiruntur absolutiones non possumus invenire, alterum tamen Deum præter eum qui est non requiramus, impietas enim hæc maxima est. Credere autem hæc talia debemus Deo, qui & nos fecit, rectissime scientes, quia scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe à verbo Dei & Spiritu ejus dictæ. Si autem in rebus creaturæ quædam quidem eorum adjacent Deo, quædam autem & in hostram venerunt scientiam, quod mali est, si & eorum, quæ in scripturis requiruntur, universis scripturis spiritualibus existentibus quædam quidem absolvamus secundum gratiam Dei, quædam autem commendemus Deo, & non solum in hoc seculo, sed & in futuro; ut semper quidem Deus doceat, homo autem semper discat. Si

ergo

ergo secundum hunc mundum, quem diximus, quædam quidem quæstiones Deo committemus, & fidem nostram servabimus, & omnis Scriptura à Deo nobis data consonans nobis inveniatur, & parabolæ his quæ manifestè dicta sunt consonabunt, & manifestè dicta dissolvent Parabolas, & per dictionum varias voces unam consonantem melodiam sonabit. *By which you see clearly what may be judged the way, and held the only way to decide all controversies, plain Scripture, and think it no absurdity for us to be ignorant of what God is not pleased to teach us in Scripture, and that you may see yet more clearly, he held Scripture as his word was perfect, containing the whole doctrine of the Gospel, which is our question.*

¶. 20. After these exceptions taken to what he says in our favours, you examine *Irenæus* for your self: and first produce these words, *Non enim per alios*, &c. the sense of which I take to be, that the Gospel or doctrine of Christ, which was to be the foundation of our faith, was by the Will of God delivered to us by writing, as well as preaching. In which, what branch there is that does so much

as concern us, truly I see not; for no body doubts but the doctrine of Christ is the foundation of our faith, that it was written as well as preached, and this not by chance, but by particular Providence and instinct of the Holy Ghost, any of which positions when I contradict, I will acknowledge *Irenæus* is against me: In the mean time I appeal to the very Rules of Syntax, whether he be not against you: and whether *Scripturis fundamentum* will agree, that Scripture be the foundation, which the construction plainly attributes to *Evangelium*; that is, the doctrine or points of faith, that is, the sense of the Letter, not the letter to be sense'd; which is the Tenet you maintain, we oppose.

There follow two long citations out of *lib.* 2. *cap.* 46. & 47. which you say, shew clearly, that plain Scripture may be judged the only way to decide all controversies: and this I deny not, for supposing Scripture to be plain enough for that effect, I see not why it should not produce it: But do the places say it is plain enough? What you think I know not; but I will assure you I am so far from thinking that question determin'd

here,

here, that no part of either of them prompts me to suspect the Father did so much as think of it. His business in these chapters, as far as I apprehend, is, in the first to shew the absurdity of opposing a fancie drawn from an obscure Parable, to an acknowledged doctrine, and even in Scripture plain to religious Lovers of truth: and in the second, to teach the impossibility of attaining to all knowledge in this life, and the necessitie of being content to know as much as God is pleas'd we should, and be ignorant of the rest. Now, if by deciding those questions, he hath given sentence in ours, from which 'tis impossible any two should be farther removed, and that by teaching Parables are not to be reli'd on, nor our thirst after knowledg satisfied in this life, he has taught Scripture is plain enough to decide all controversies in all times and cases. He has done both what he never thought to do, and what I think impossible he ever should doe.

¶. 11. *In his third book*, cap. 14. Si autem Lucas quidem, qui semper cum Paulo prædicavit, & dilectus ab eo dictus

est, & cum eo evangelizavit, & creditum est referre nobis evangelium, nihil aliud ab eo didicit, sicut ex verbis ejus ostensum est, quemadmodum hi, qui nunquam Paulo adjuncti fuerunt, gloriantur abscondita & inerrabilia didicisse Sacramenta? Quoniam autem Paulus simpliciter, quæ sciebat hæc & docebat, non solum eos, qui cum eo erant, verum omnes audientes, seipsum fecit manifestum. In Mileto convocatis Episcopis & Presbyteriis, (repeats those words, *Acts* 20. 17. and so on) non subtraxi uti non annuntiarem vobis omnem sententiam Dei. Sic Apostoli simpliciter & nemini invidentes, quæ didicerant ipsi a Domino, hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur & Lucas nemini invidens, ea quæ ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testificatur dicens, quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis, qui ab initio contemplatores & ministri fuerunt verbi. *Observe, I pray you, and impartially weigh the truth,* Irenæus *is professedly disputing against the* Valentinians *throughout his whole book, confutes them all along by Scripture, answers their objections, (which is the very same with yours against us) the Scriptures do not contain all*

divine

divine truths and mysteries, and therefore they would not be judged nor confuted by it (as you at this day.) Irenæus first proves out of Scripture, that the Apostles delivered freely, plainly, the whole mystery or doctrine of salvation to all, envying the knowledge of it, or any part of that knowledge, to none great or small, therefore not to S. Luke who was a continual companion of the Apostle Paul, and a beloved fellow-labourer; So that he S. Luke must needs know all, and out of S. Lukes words (the very same I have before made my Argument, the beginning of his Gospel and the Acts) shews he did faithfully relate all he had received and learnt of the Apostles, not envying us any one truth [what is the meaning of that expression] he himself had learnt. Besides what force could there have been in Irenæus his Argument; or indeed to what purpose would his whole Book have been, proving from Scripture all along his Adversaries to be out, and their Tenet to be false, because the Scripture doth not teach them: if the Scripture be not such a perfect Rule, which contains the whole Mystery of salvation, and doctrine of the Gospel.

Thus I think (if I am not mightily mistaken)

Judges.) I have proved the Minor Propositive which only can be questioned of that Syllogism, which disproves Mr. Rushworths second Dialogue. That which hath been the rule in the Primitive Church must still be.

But the Written Word, which we enjoy was the rule, as appears by what hath been said.

Ergo, *The Scriptures still is, &c.*

¶ 11. The last is out of the fourteenth Chapter of the third Book, which to make strong against us, you assume two things, and I conceive neither true: First, That he confutes them all along by Scriptures; which I do not see, how it would advantage you were it admitted; for because he saw it convenient to dispute out of Scripture, will it therefore follow, no other way of disputing is either lawfull or possible: We dispute with you every day out of Scripture, yet hold another a surer, nay the onely rule; but I wonder the diligence you profess should so far deceive the candour you are master of, as to offer it for true, which cannot but have observed the first Chapters of this very Book are employed in confuting

futing them by Tradition, and that Scripture is made use of, not for necessity (I cannot speak more of the abundant efficacy of Tradition then he does) but out of abundance, *ut undique resistatur illis si quos ex his retusione confundentes ad conversionem veritatis adducere possimus*, as he says in the 2d Chapter of this Book, which you see is an expression not of necessity, but charity. And if I am not mistaken, for I have not the means to studie it exactly, his whole second Book is so fill'd with Arguments from reason, That Scripture is hardly so much as mentioned, unless sometimes by the by.

Secondly, you assume with as much injustice, as mistake, that their Objection is the same with ours, and the Answer given by him to them, the same you give to us: Our Tenet (for objection, while we are upon the defensive, we make none) is that Scripture is not the rule of Faith; That of the *Valentinians*, that I mean which *Irenæus* speaks to in this place, was, as you may see in the beginning of the thirteenth Chapter, that none but S. *Paul* was acquainted with the truth, as having only received it by revelation, whereby

whereby all his Arguments in the precedent Chapter, from the authorities of S. *Peter*, S. *Stephen*, S. *Philip*, &c. had been overthrown; to strengthen them, he proves in the thirteenth chapter, that not only S. *Paul*, but the rest of the Disciples also understood the Mystery of Salvation; and in the 14 particularly S. *Luke* and these two, *Viz.* Scripture is not the sole rule of Faith, S. *Paul* alone was acquainted with the Mysteries of Salvation, an exact studiar of *Irenæus*, and impartial lover of truth, would have to be the same. As to the place it self; this I conceive to be your Argument, S. *Paul* delivered all he knew to S. *Luke*. S. *Luke* writ all was delivered him; therefore S. *Paul* knew all that was necessary to salvation, S. *Luke* writ all was necessary to salvation. To which I have already answered, that though I should admit the Conclusion, little would be advanced in order to our Question, since we deny not but all may be contained in Scripture some way or other, particularly, or under general heads, but that all is so contain'd, as is necessary for the salvation of mankind; to which effect we conceive certainly, and

to

to that evidence requisite, neither of which are within the compass of naked words, left without any guard to the violent and contrary storms of Criticism.

But I conceive you do the Saint wrong, and understand the word *all* in a sence far different from what he did; for having learnt from *S. John*, so little a Book as *S. Lukes* could not hold truly all, till you can prove he meant his Book for a rule of Faith, and intended to deliver in it all things necessary to salvation, I must beleeve 'tis no ordinary violence that can force such a sence upon it, as has neither a likely, nor any ground; but since your own profession, and large citations, shew both a confidence and esteem of *Irenaus*, give me leave with that serious earnestness, which the concern of eternity, for no less is in Question, requires, to presse your own words upon you, and desire you to observe and impartially weigh the Truth, while I represent the proceedings of *Irenaus* to you, and make you judge whether of us take part with the Father, whether with his Adversaries. The Error of the *Valentinians*,

nians, was built upon certain obscure places of Scripture, or rather indeed upon certain deceitful reasonings in Philosophy (as your denial of Transubstantiation, for example is, and a denial even of the B. Trinity, if you pleas'd might be) but perceiving the Rules of Christianity did not allow that for a foundation of Faith, they endeavoured to support the edifice by Scripture, bragging, no doubt, among their followers, it was clearly on their side, but being pres'd to a Tryal, giving in evidence the obscure places mentioned.

Against this, *Irenæus* contends that Parables, because capable of many Solutions, are not to be relyed upon, and consequently, since only the true sense of Scripture is Scripture, that Scripture is vainly pretended, where the many sences leave us uncertain which is the true one. Then examining the places for his side, and shewing them both in clearness and number to over-ballance the other, he overthrows their pretence, and preserves the majesty of Scripture to his party: The same do we to you, who, building most of your mistakes in Faith, upon

mistakes

miſtakes in Philoſophy, pretend plain Scripture, and when it comes to tryal, bring places capable of as many fences, as the *Valentinian* parables were of ſolutions. We anſwer, as he did, that there is no relying upon ſuch places: And, examining thoſe we conceive to be of our ſide, and comparing them with yours, both in clearneſs and number, conclude your fences not true, and Scripture not only not for you, but againſt you. Yet all this while neither he, nor we think Scripture, for this diſputing out of it, the only rule of Faith, whether it be, or no, being not in theſe caſes, our queſtion. But ſince as the *Valentinians* did then, you will now undertake to prove Scripture is againſt us, and as *Irenæus* then, ſo we now acknowledge nothing is to be held againſt Scripture, we do, as he did, ſhew you cannot make good your undertaking.

Next, The *Valentinians*, by the priviledg of their neerneſs to the Primitive times better acquainted with the grounds of faith then your, would have ſtabliſhed their Interpretations by Tradition: an evident proof what it was which thoſe firſt Ages held the Interpreter of Scripture,

and that ſo undeniably, that even Hereticks pretended to it. What ſays *Irenæus* to this? Does he anſwer as you do, that Tradition is not to be regarded, but the cauſe to be decided by Scripture, and that the only Rule? by no means: but carefully and diligently proves Tradition to be againſt them: Which he alſo declares to be, not what they pretended, by abuſe of thoſe words, *Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos*, whiſpering corner conveyances of one to another (ſuch as the *Cabala* you object to us) but the open, plain profeſſion of thoſe Churches to whom the Apoſtles left their doctrine and its practice, and among which, he conceives that of the *Roman* Church alone ſufficient.

This publike Teſtimony, as he, ſo we lay claim to, and profeſs with him, would be ſufficient, even though there were no Scriptures at all; which nevertheleſs ſince Gods infinite goodneſs has provided for us, we do not underſtand the force of the former impaired by the addition of a new force. But, that belonging to another queſtion, give me leave to end the preſent one with this confidence,

that

that you cannot but see we follow the Fathers steps, and you those who follow the *Valentinians*, and that it appears by what hath been said, your Minor neither is, nor, since you have failed, in likelihood ever will be proved.

PART II.
Tradition the Rule of Faith.

SECT. I.
Of Certainty of Tradition.

¶ 1. *IN the third* Dialogue, *the certainty of your Traditions (having endeavoured to take away the certainty of Scripture, I think in vain) is endeavoured. I was glad of the promise, to do the work only by reason and common sence, without any quotations of Authors, because I want that vast knowledge in Antiquity, which is requisite for the deciding of this Question by it; but I see my hopes are frustrated, for your cause neither is here, nor can be proved by reason alone, without that reading which yet I want. The Reasons here or any other, that may be man-*

managed without quotations of Authors, I am ready to see and examine, and as ready to subscribe unto, if they convince me; but I thinke it unreasonable for you to pretend to prove your Religion infallible, and yet bring no positive Arguments that are of themselues sufficient to convince, but only to stand upon your guard; thats all Mr White doth; a subtile Turk might the same way prove as well his false religion, true.

PART II.

SECT. 1. ¶ 1.

BEing now arrived at the second Part of your Discourse, I find nothing in the first Paraph necessary to be taken notice of but the last words, *Viz.* That *'tis unreasonable to pretend to prove our Religion infallible*, and yet *bring no positive Arguments*, &c. In the first Branch of which saying you are not much amiss; nothing being more unreasonable, then that a Church, which confessedly

was once the true one, ſhould be put to prove ſhe is now no falſe one, when all the Maximes of common ſence, and proceedings of nature, ſuppoſe her innocence, till the contrary be, not by ſurmiſes and probabilities, but plainly and undeniably proved. Whoever therefore ſays ſhe has faild, ought to prove it, and not expect ſhe ſhould prove the impoſſibility of the contrary. 'Tis true, the condeſcendence of charity has prevailed to undertake ſo unreaſonable a Task here, but not without proteſting againſt the neceſſity of doing it, as you ſee in the ſecond Paraph of this *Dialogue*. But the ſecond is ſo injurious, that, had all men been of your temper, perhaps it would have been well done to have ſtood wholly upon that ſure guard you reproach Mr *White* withal, and which the advantage of his cauſe gives him, and never medled with poſitive Arguments, which though unanſwered, and for ought I can imagin, unanſwerable, ſince I do not beleeve any man can ſay more then you have done, you would yet deny to be ſo much as Arguments.

That perſwaſion of yours too, which thinks

thinks so much reading necessary to your Information, I cannot allow of, but because you produce no reason for it, can oppose it no otherwise, then by professing my dislike of it.

¶ 2. *In his first Encounter he gives a Compendium of the Argument*, page 3. *Her doctrine is received from Christ and still handed along to the present time: Suppose I say, for example, in the eighth Age an Error crept in: He'l reply, it entred not in, because that Age held nothing was to be admitted as of Faith, except that was delivered to it by the former, therefore seeing that was then first believed, it was not delivered by the former, therefore not received. I answer, no new opinion, when first it creeps up, is entertaind by any as a new thing which was not before, but as forgotten, or not discern'd, or lost before; do you think the Arians look't upon their Doctrine as new, which was never believed before, or that was contrary to what the Apostles taught? If they did, they would have cast off all Christianity, and held nothing with the Orthodox.* Mr White *brings in our Objection, The Church did not stand upon that same traditional ground formerly, as* Rome *now. Here plys,*

If

If this principle did not always govern the Church, it was introduced in some Age, the eighth for example, either (says he against this) the Church had assurance in that eighth Age, all she held was descended lineally, as we speak, from the Apostles, or not; if she had, then questionless she held her Doctrine upon that Maxime: If not, then she wilfully belied, and damned, &c. voluntarily taking up this new, &c. Is this the Demonstration?

¶ 2. Your stating, and opposing Mr *Whites* Argument, making me suspect you did not yet perfectly comprehend it; I beg leave to put you in mind, there are two things he endeavours to prove. 1. That if the Church always rely'd upon the Maxime of immediate delivery, she could admit no error into her Faith: 2. That she did always rely upon that Maxime. The first he proves thus, if an Error came in, it came in at some time, let that time be the eighth Age, and if the Church then admitted nothing but what she had received, and this she had not received (for you put it then first to come in) she did not admit it then, nor by the same evidence could admit any error in any age:

No

To the second we shall speak in the fourth Paraph; to this you answer, no new opinion is entertain'd, as a new thing which was not before, but as forgotten, or not discern'd, or lost before: An Answer which I dare not profess a perfect comprehension of, not seeing to which of the premises 'tis directly oppos'd by a plain grant, denial, or distinction, one of which ought always to keep company with every answer: but conceive the force of the Argument is not any thing empair'd by it; for let it be entertain'd as lost, as forgotten, or how you will, so it were not immediatly delivered, either the Rule must be broken, or it could not be entertain'd. And this I think evident, even by your very termes; for if it were entertain'd as forgotten, then 'twas entertain'd as a thing which some former Age forgot to deliver, then some former Age did not deliver it, then, if nothing were entertain'd but what was delivered, pray how could this find entertainment?

To your question of the *Arians*, I answer 'tis very likely the Ringleaders among them perswaded their followers such fine

things

things as you say. That their doctrine was not new, &c. but nothing could blinde them so far as not to see, 'twas not taught them by their immediate forefathers. And though conceit of *Arius's* vertue and learning prevail'd with the more ignorant, as ambition and interest with the more subtle, not to value and to desert this Rule, yet 'twas impossible they should be ignorant that they did desert it. They would then have cast off all Christianity, say you, and truly the experience of my own Countrey makes me believe they would, had they continued unopposed long enough to have pursued their principle, whether it would have led them. But nature endures not an immediate passage from one extreme to another; a consideration, which being touched before, I now say no more to, and passe to your next difficultie, which, by your acknowledging it brought in by Mr. *Whites* objection, I perceive, is levelled against the second not the first Conclusion: our businesse now therefore is to examine, whether the Church hath always adhered to this maxime, there being no dispute, but that (if she hath) she could

not

not admit of any Error in her Faith.

¶ 3. *This I dare sure of, that either I do understand nothing of it, or there's no force in it: By assurance I suppose he means not absolute certainty; if he do, the second horn of the Dilemma upon which we fall, does us no hurt; I conceive he means thoughts; if the eighth Age thought all she held was descended lineally from the Apostles, then she held her Doctrine upon that Maxim: But she thought all she held was descended lineally from the Apostles (is not that the Minor to be supplied, if we turn the first part into a Catagorical Syllogism) therefore she held her Doctrine upon that Maxim. This I think is the Conclusion, for I do not clearly discern his meaning, suppose only I grant the Conclusion, me thinks he does not conclude what he was to prove, which should be this, therefore that Age was not the first that held her Doctrine upon that Maxim. But to the other part of the Dilemma more fully.*

¶ 3. You chuse to fall upon the second horn of the *Dilemma*, whose sharpnesse we shall presently try, after I have assur'd you, that by *assurance*, he means absolute certainty; which there is no denying,

denying but that she either had, or had not. In the first Case his Discourse runs thus: she had assurance in the eighth Age, before she took up the Maxime said to be new, therefore she had the Maxime, by which she had assurance, before; this Maxime could be no other then *Tradition*, nothing else being able to give her assurance, therefore she had the Maxime of *Tradition* before, therefore that Age was not the first she took it up in; which is what you desire should be the Conclusion.

¶ 4. *If not (says he) then she wilfully belied her self, &c. I wholly deny this wilfulness will follow; thus the 8th Age entertained that principle first of all, suppose she might think it true, when it was not, and so no wilfulness; might not the Church think all she held descended to her through the interjacent Ages by the Bible which is handed still to her, and yet not think all she received descended lineally in your sence? I pray Sir, make my dull capacitie see this absurdity, which I profess I cannot; I think if your Argument prove any thing, it proves against all Errors in general any where, that they could not have come into*

the

the world, and then I wish exceedingly your Argument were true. The Heretick held no Error, because he held nothing was to be embraced but truth; Is not this the very same Argument? Mr White *says some of yours maintain Tenets in other termes, that are condemned; might I not prove the contrary by his own Argument; the Error could not enter into them, because they held nothing was to be entertaind, as of Faith, except what was delivered to them by the former; this is the very Argument: To say the case is not the same in respect of universality is not to the purpose; for there is no universality mentioned in the Argument, the stress is not yet put in that; If the argument be true in one, I see not why it should not be in another.*

¶ 4. But you take the second Part, in which case he presses you deny, an unadmittable wilfulness: Let us see; The Supposition puts the Church not assured whether her Doctrine were lineally descended, or no; The Maxime makes her oblige her Posterity, under pain of damnation too, to beleeve it was so descended, that is to beleeve what she knew not to be true, that is, what for ought she

knew was false,& yet you discover no wilfulness. Pray can reason justifie a command to accept that for true, which the Commander knows may be false, and for ought he knows is so? and is there any other principle of action, besides reason, but will? I but she might think her Principle true, when it was not; but what if no greater wilfulness can be imagined then to think so? for you must mean it true, either in respect it had conveied the true faith to her, or would convey the true Faith to her posterity. The first is Nonsence, for that Age being supposed the first in which she took up the Principle, the faith she had must of necessity have been conveid to her by some other. The second is as bad or worse, for if that principle be the Test of true Faith, her own, not being received by it, must needs be thought not to be true, & that being the Faith she commended to the principle to be conveid, could even wilfulness make her think that principle would convey a true Faith to her posterity, which had received a false one to convey?

But she might, say you, think her Doctrine true, as taught by the Bible, which

Bible

Bible was handed down to her, though her Doctrine were not: If she did but think so, she did not know it to be true; therefore it was not certain to her, therefore but probable; therefore to recommend it as true and certain, which to her was not so, was to do what she had no ground for, that is to act wilfully.

Again, if she thought her self to have received the true faith from the Bible, she must needs think the Bible a means to convey the true faith to her, that is a true rule, then to desert that which she thought a true one, and impose another as the onely true one, besides which, she thought, even when she impos'd the second, the first also to be true, pray what name can it own but *wilfulness*? Thus which way soever we turn, nothing appears but impossibility; which also a little reflected on, would be discovered much greater, and far deeper plunged into contradiction: For were it possible a Council, for example, should be so maliciously wilfull, as to consent to the damnation of all posterity; mankind has rooted in it a greater desire of its own good, then to be so cheated into

everlasting misery, especially so openly that it could not be ignorant of the juggle. But neither is it proper for me to dilate that am an Answerer, neither is it necessary to one that sees day so soon as you do.

To go on then, you think the Argument proves against all Errors, if any thing, but why you think so, you do not say, and indeed I cannot guess: One only supposition seems able to give the fancie any colour, *Viz.* That our Saviour, besides those necessary to Salvation, taught also all manner of other truths whatsoever, in all Arts and Sciences, *&c.* All which, being equally recommended to *Tradition*, flow down in the same great channel to us, but this me thinks is too wild a fancie to suspect you of. Next, you parallel our Argument with one you frame in behalf of an Heretick in this manner: He holds nothing is to be embraced but truth, therefore what he imbraces is truth; put your Heretick to have a right method of arriving at truth, and faithfully to pursue it, and there is no doubt but your Conclusion is strong, and so strong that it quite overthrows the

the Supposition, for he cannot in that case be an Heretick; but that he has any such method, or makes any use of it, we must seek elsewhere then in your Argument, which out of this that the thing should be done, concludes it is done. By the sincerity you profess, and ow to the concern of eternity, do we argue in that manner? Do not we prove both that our method cannot fail us, and that we never failed to make use of our method? The first under penalty of this evident contradiction, that the same thing must be beleeved before, and not before the same time; the second by the impossibility that mankind should conspire notoriously and unconcealably to cheat their posterity into everlasting damnation. And is this to say the Conclusion over in the Antecedent, and then infer it in the Consequent: Beseech you, Sir, restrain those sallies of wit, to things lesse dangerous to be plaid upon then salvation.

Lastly, you object Mr *Whitrs* saying that several condemn'd Tenets are maintain'd in other terms by some Divines, and assume that these Divines, holding nothing

as of Faith but what was delivered by the former age, would have no Error. And that is true, meaning Errors in Faith, but Divines proceed upon other Rules when they err, and their Errors concern not Faith but Divinity. It may indeed so happen, that these Errors in Divinity do also contradict some point of Faith; but that the equivocation of terms hinders them from seeing, in which case the Position is erroneous, and against Faith, the beleef of the maintainer, who sees not so much, very good and unblameable. Now, if I understand the Position right, 'tis no more then this, that some Divines understand not the force of terms used by themselves, which rigorously scanned may happen to contain an error unperceived by him who uses them, but dives not so far into them. Remember then, if you please, the case is of Divines, that is of persons working according to the rules of Science, not of faithful proceeding upon grounds of Faith, after which I hope you will not infer an Error in the rule of Faith, because there be errors in things concluded by other Principles.

¶ 5. *And truly if I have eyes*, Mr Rushworth

worth does not more then shew a kinde of possibilitie, that all points of faith could have been handed down, the first delivered them to the second Age, the third heard them of the second, the fourth of the third, &c. But is this a proving of it, that it was so, or that no material corruptions could have crept in, why else does he object against himself what is most obvious to be seen, A posse ad esse non valet consequentia? That cuts the throat of his Arguments, so that yet there's no certainty proved, that which he answers is indeed reasonable, you should think they were, because they might be so handed; but go no further yet, till you prove more, and seeing you conceive a possibilitie of such descent, Remember the contrary possibilitie (much more probable) that there may be errors crept in; but till you see, you will not beleeve they are, I shall not entreat you out of your Religion, only I beg and wish you hold no more then your Arguments prove, only a possibilitie, but it is easier to deviate from the streight rule of truth, then alwayes to keep to it.

¶. 5. When you writ this Paragraph, your thoughts certainly were so fixed upon the place in which your objection is brought in, that the next leaves, almost the

the next lines, escape their observance. The least advance would have suggested to them, that not only a possibility of preserving truth, but a plain actual indefectibility is aim'd at. Not but that a possibility is enough, such a possibility I mean, or power, as we speak of, that is, such as has the nature of a proper cause to its effect, that is, which should have done the effect. Since if our Rule be proper to convey the truth to us, no body can rationally affirm it has not done, what 'tis granted, 'twas of its own nature apt to do, without evidencing what he says. Let those therefore, who, upon pretence of errors, refuse communion with us, take it to heart, and either plainly evince him, or tremble at the horrour of living in a continued and obstinate schisme. As for the edge of that maxime, *A posse ad esse non valet consequentia*; The *Dialogues* shew 'tis taken off by this other, *frustra est potentia quæ nunquam reducitur in actum*, the power in this case being but to one effect, and to repeat what they say, which is all I have to do, seems unnecessary.

To guess at what the following dis-

course

courſe aims, which puts a poſſibility of truth, and a poſſibility of error, this indeed the more probable, but no more then probable, I am quite at a loſſe. Would you have no certaintie in Religion, that is, no Religion at all in the world? For with what ſteadineſs can I act in order towards Heaven, if my thoughts be perpetually checkt with this doubt, for example, that perhaps there is no Heaven at all; and if I be uncertain of it, is it poſſible to ſhake off the doubt? Till I comprehend your deſign therfore, I ſhall only deſire you to reflect, that if the poſſibility of error be only the more probable, then 'tis but probable, then the contrary, though leſs, is yet probable too; then it may be there are no errors in the Church you refuſe communion with. Therefore, ſince to divide, is as much as lies in the divider, to deſtroy the Church, and to deſtroy the Church is to take away all hopes of ſalvation, (for ſince we cannot know the way to Heaven of our ſelves, if we loſe our miſtreſs that ſhould teach it us, there can remain no ground of hope,) and this from all mankind, conſider, if you pleaſe what

'tis

'tis to continue a ſeparation, and at the ſame time acknowledg:, that perhaps there are no errors, that is, no ground why you ſhould do ſo. But we will beleeve no errors till we ſee them; no indeed, we will not contradict nature ſo much, which ſuppoſes every man innocent till he be proved guilty.

In return to your civility of not intreating me out of my Religion, I will intreat you not to be out of it neither, and to remember, that your ſoul being equally concern'd with mine, 'tis your obligation as well as mine, not to beleeve any errors, where you ſee there may be none, till you ſee they are there, and that not probably, but with undeniable evidence, when, as you will be able to ſhew them, I promiſe you, I will be ready to deſert them.

¶. 6. *But Mr.* White *would fain prove more from the natural inclination of truth and happineſs: this I think if it prove any thing, proves man will needs be a groping after ſome Religion or other, but that it ſhould be after the true, or make him preſerve the true Religion, (I ſhall give Account why I will*

not

not assent unto) without corruption, I see not, or why it should not prove as well that every particular man, in whom there is such an inclination, should preserve the truth.

My Reason why that inclination spoken of doth no way prove the Point, is from the fall of Adam, *if there were no such thing as the corruption of mans nature, Mr* Whites *Reason would have more likelihood in it, and hereby appears the weakness of your cause, in that you are fain (the acutest of you) to have recourse to such Bulrushes to make weapons of, as the corrupt nature of man ready to uphold (what, the pure Oracles of God?) No, the contrary rather. The natural man or man by nature is blinded, and sees not the things of God, they are contrary to him, rather inclines to Superstition then the true Worship of God, is naturally more steady in Idolatry then the pure service of God; will you not take my word for this? Read* Jer. 2. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. *seee if there be such a thing; Hath a Nation changed their Gods, which yet are no Gods; but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit.*

¶ 5.

¶ 6. I think you mistake Mr *White's* Argument here: And first whereas you put a natural inclination to truth and happiness; His words are, that hopes and fears in the will, ignorance and the conceit of another mans knowledge in the understanding, are the Parents of Religion: And I presume you mean the same thing, but speak contractedly. Now I conceive 'tis not from this barely, he proves the preservation of true Religion, as you seem to suppose, but from hence, that man being not to be wrought upon but by reason, authority, or power, none of the three can be imagined to have place, where the Religion is supposed once true, and largely dispersed: So that you seem to take a part of the Argument for the whole.

As for the difficulty from the corrupti- of nature in man, 'tis that corruption which makes him deceivable by the ways mentioned for were his nature entirely sound, neither power nor authority could be imagined forcible enough to prevail with him against his own good, and reason cannot be supposed opposite to truth. So that were there no corruptions, there would

would be neither neceſſity of nor place for the Argument, which contends, That ſince there are but three ways, even in this ſtate of miſery, to work upon a man, and that none of them can be effectual in our caſe, the divine goodneſs has provided even againſt the defects of nature, and placed the ſecurity of our faith, beyond the reach of its corruptions; for however vice may byas a man in opinion by hindring the faithful working of his Reaſons it, withal its malice, cannot hinder him from uſing his eyes and ears in plain matters of fact, which is all our Rule of Faith requires; the fall of *Adam* then makes not the Argument weak, but neceſſary.

But perhaps it may contribute to your ſatisfaction to obſerve, that nature is ſpoken of man in different ſignifications; for ſometimes by that word is meant Reaſon, ſometimes that frame of corporeal Inſtruments which concur to its being an Animal: Now when you hear of the bad Inclinations of Nature, and natural men, 'tis to be underſtood of the diſorder occaſioned principally in the body by the ſin of *Adam*, and by the

union of it with the ſoul, drawing her into evils, which are therefore ſuch, becauſe they are againſt nature, it being unpoſſible that ſhould be ill, which to nature is conformable: Man is therefore truly drawn againſt his nature, even when he follows thoſe which you call his natural inclinations to ſin; for ſince he is *animal rationale*, if Reaſon be not his nature, he is no more a man. Now the Argument proves that natural diſorders, taking nature in the ſecond ſence, have not the power to prevail upon his nature, taken in the firſt ſence, either to loſe all Religion, or change the true one in the Circumſtances accompanying our caſe: For it being natural to man, that his words ſhould flow from his thoughts, and conformably to them, when a lie is told, that is, words are brought forth diſ-formable to the thoughts of the ſpeaker, 'tis plain that nature is croſſed, and deſign works, that is artifice, that is not nature. And ſo we ſee that thoſe, who are not in a condition to uſe deſign, as fools and drunken men, always tell truth. Further, thoſe who lie, deſign, or aim at, ſome end attainable by lying, thus force their nature, unleſſe the

the design be only mirth, rising from the odness of the lie, must either hope to cloath it with an appearance of truth, and conceal it from being known to be what it is, or despair of compassing their design, nothing being more evident, then that no man will be perswaded by a known untruth.

Put then the Tenets of Religion to be universally dispersed, and visible in practice, and the people strongly possessed of the truth of them, is it not undeniable that who would go about to perswade them, either that the former Tenets were not held and practised, or that some *new* invention was formerly held and practised, must be known by every body, to tell an open manifest lie, that is can have no hopes of concealing it, nor consequently of prevailing with it, or compassing any design by it, that is, if he have wit enough to see the impossibility, such a liar must act without a motive (for none acts for a thing held clearly impossible) and so the actions be directly carried out of the sphere of whole rational nature which is obliged to act for some end or motive good or bad. You see then, that in both cases rational nature, taking original sin,

and the corruptions flowing from it into the bargain, is destroyed and overthrown by such an action, even of one single man, to which if we add the multitudes, the millions that must conspire to this unnatural lie, since otherwise their authority can never over-bear the counterpoize of those who will adhere to manifest and known truth, the impossibility swels to a proportion so monstrous, that it seems beyond the power even of Arithmetick it self to comprehend it. And so much, though but little in respect of the latitude of the subject, and strange advantages our rule of Faith bears with it, for mans inclination to truth, that is, as he has an understanding power in him.

Let us see what follows from his inclination to happiness, which is so the object of his will that it cannot act without an aim at some good, either reall or apparent. Put men strongly to conceit their beatitude, or eternal well-being, and that it depends wholly upon the Tenets which make up their Religion, is it not evident, this conceit still remaining, which is our case, that there cannot be imaginable any greater hopes or fears, (that is, greater

greater motives to the will) then certainly beleeved enjoyment of heaven, or punishment in Hell, and this for all eternity? which being so, 'tis as certainly demonstrated, that a multitude of men, thus affected, shall not be byassed to prevaricate from so concerning truths, and propagate so prejudicial falshoods, as they look upon those to be which contradict their Religion, as it is that a straw cannot weigh down a thousand pounds.

Now put the Religion to be true, so be universally dispersed, and this the Test of it, to admit nothing into it, but upon the account of inheritance from immediate Fathers, as from the first deliverer, and this so, as that it be all one to be not inherited, and to be not Religion (which three things though the present business do not require they should be urged, are yet manifest in our case, the two last being visible, almost to blindness, and the first undeniable to Christianity; since it cannot be doubted, but that the Religion which Christ delivered was true) and you may if you please perceive that the fall of *Adam* is so far from necessarily occasioning a fall from true Religion, that

that mankind, once poſſeſt of the truth; and this method to preſerve it, muſt plainly fall from its nature, and degenerate into beaſt, or ſomthing worſe, if it be not as ſteady in the pure ſervice of God, and preſervation of the truth, as of it ſelf; the props which uphold the former being full as ſtrong, if not more then thoſe which ſuſtain the later.

¶ 7. *The Inclination you ſpeak of to underprop your tottering infallibility, is very ſteady to uphold corruptions, and ſuperſtition as we accuſe you of, not ſo the pure Worſhip of God. Again. I pray tell me, ſince you have only proved, or rather ſhown a poſſibility of your Doctrines ſucceſſion, Is it not more poſſible to deviate from the right line then to keep cloſe to it? This probability is ſtronger againſt you then any (I cannot ſee they are any more then probabilities) you bring for your ſelves, that there could be no error univerſally ſpread over your Church: Shall I give you an inſtance to prove the poſſibility. The Jews Church, when their Forefathers were brought out of* Egypt, *had not the whole Nation every man of them ſufficient Inſtruction in and confirmation of the true worſhip of God, ſo many*

many wonders and signes as they had, yet did they not corrupt the worship? I hope 40 yeers is sufficient (Mr White thought three yeers enough for the Apostles to be in one place) to teach the ways of God, and all those miracles they had to confirm them after they were setled in the land of Canaan, how could they lose any points of Doctrine received, or their Trnditions be corrupted, if your Arguments hold: Was it not possible (seeing it has been) they should afterward again, bring in their Traditions for Truths, by which they made void the Law of God, as our Saviour speaks, and those Traditions (as Mr. White p. 124.) went among the Jews for currant sound Law, and afterward continued; ask them in one of those after Ages, whether it came from Moses, (suppose one of those false Traditions) he may answer (says Mr White p. 126.) he received it from their Predecessors, but they can yeeld no account why any Age may not have changed that, but why may not the Jew ask in what age (as you do us) or year their Doctrine was corrupted; but (says Mr. White) If I assign an age or yeer, can they acquit themselves in point of proof? (and so I say of you) clearly they cannot: for

since

since there was no Register, nor visible effects of this Doctrine; and so unless you can shew a Register or effects for every age and yeer, you cannot prove there have been no corruptions among you, and so all your infallibility depends upon uncertainty; what if there be not Histories and Records of all passages of the Church (as likely there are not) how can I be sure there have been no such changes as are possible? and where now is your certain proof?

¶. 7. The nature of man then, being reason, see not why you should so confidently affirm, he is naturally more steady in idolatry then the pure service of God, unless you will make the disorder of reason more his nature then reason it self. What follows is an odd perseverance of yours, when by taking so much pains to shew he has not demonstrated, you cannot but acknowledge he pretends to have done so. Your question, whether it be not more possible to deviate from, then to keep close to the right line? will find an answer in this reflexion, that if a thing be made to keep us in a right line, and to guide mankinde so powerfully by it, that the line cannot be deviated from, without a deviation from nature,

ture, (and this I have shewn to be our case) 'twill be harder to deviate from, then to keep in it: as it is very difficult to force a falling Port-cullis into a crooked line, which by the nature of its weight, and directions of Art is determined to a streight one.

The rest of this Paragraph, and the whole following one presses the failing of the Jews, an example against which there lie innumerable exceptions: for first, they were a particular Nation, subject to be wrought upon by hopes and fears, when any of their Princes went about to make his own wickedness National; from which spring most of their failings were derived. Again, there wanted in their breasts that great fire of Pentecost, which together with Christian Religion, planted in their hearts that received it, an unspeakable esteem of it, and a certain perswasion that all things, even life it self were to be neglected for it, the advantage of future goods infinitely overvaluing all possible evils in this world. Whereas, as far as I can perceive, the conceit, which the Jewes had of the next world, was very weak

and

and ſlothful, being led, even to the keeping of the Law, by hopes of temporal goods promiſed to the obſervers, the myſtical Land of Promiſe being generally apprehended but feebly.

But, what moſt imports, you ſay nothing, and I think can ſay nothing to prove *Tradition* was their rule. Their Law was delivered immediatly to *Moſes*, and by him left in writing, whoſe Interpretation was reſerved to the High Prieſt, what has this proceeding to do with *Tradition*? Or would you have it preſerve them from failing, who neither made uſe of it, nor had it to make uſe of? if *Tradition* were not their rule, which that it was I do not ſee how it can be aſſerted, pray what does their failing concern us? If not that, but the written Word was their Rule, which I do not ſee how it can be deny'd, pray what hinders your Diſcourſe to be concluſive againſt your ſelf, and their failing an evidence, that the written Word is no preſervative againſt Errors? This you would do well to reflect upon: Mean while your Argument againſt the ſecurity we pretend to by *Tradition* ſtands thus; the *Jews* had errors

rors who followed it not, therefore we, who do, cannot be without them: A diſcourſe which as I ſhould never have expected from you, ſo I know not whether your ſecond thoughts will think fit to own.

But to deſcend to particulars: *Had not the whole Nation of the Jews every man ſufficient inſtruction in, and confirmation of the true Worſhip of God, yet did they not corrupt the Worſhip?* How far the inſtruction of the Jews was derived to particular men, I am not able to anſwer, and I doubt you do but gueſs. This I ſee that thoſe things which were commended to the practice of the multitude, as their *Feaſts, Circumciſion*, &c. remained entire among all their failings, though they were but a particular Nation, and wanted that inward fire of charity infuſed by the Holy Ghoſt, together with Chriſtianity into the hearts of the firſt beleevers. And you ſpeak of the corruption of their Traditions, that is, private Interpretations of their Law, ſo far from being underſtood & practis'd by the multitude, that being delivered with the ſeal of ſecrecie, they were not ſo much as known to them.

To

To answer your Argument then, what do you mean by *sufficient instruction?* that particular men were instructed by the Law sufficiently to go to Heaven, I conceive true: but that the instruction of particular men was sufficient to preserve the Law from being corrupted, I cannot grant; since I think there is not, in a particular Nation, force enough to defend it self from the numerous, and violent assaults, which the corruption of nature, you just now insisted on, will be sure to make upon it. But *how could they lose any point of doctrine if* Mr. Whites *Argument hold?* Pray does his Argument secure those, who neither make use of *Tradition* for their Rule, nor have it to make use of? *I, but was it not possible they should bring in their Traditions to make void the Law of God?* See how weak a thing 'tis to dispute out of words. The Traditions you speak of are no more *Traditions*. then Jews are Christians. These private Cabalistical interpretations of Scripture, made by unknown Authors, and handed privately from one confident to another, as Doctors among the Vulgar upon the authority of private men, are what their

word

word signifies, and our Saviour reprehends. And becauſe theſe made void the Law of God, ſhall therefore the thoughts and actions of an univerſality of people, in which there can be no juggle, nothing concealed, and which have nothing at all common with the former, undergo the ſame condemnation.

After this you retort *Mr Whites* anſwer to the *Jew* upon himſelf, and urge that unleſs we can ſhew a regiſter, and viſible effects for every age and year, we cannot prove there has been no corruption among us. If this will content you, 'twill not be very difficult to give you ſatisfaction; for I beſeech you are not the actions of mankind viſible effects of the perſwaſion from whence they flow? if you find people going to *Maſs*, adoring the *holy Sacrifice*, aſſiſting at *Dirges*, reverencing *Images*, &c. will you doubt of their faith concerning theſe particulars? Behold then the viſible effects of Religion, which if you aſſign any Age in which they were introduced, we thus acquit our ſelves, without the help of Hiſtory or Records in point of proof. It being much more impoſſible things

of that notorious publikeneſs could be introduced without notice being taken that they were ſo, then for a Tumbler to ſhew tricks from *Pauls* to *Weſtminſter*, and no body regard him, the age you aſſign could not but know they were then brought in: But the principle of that Age being to receive nothing but what was delivered by her Foreſathers, ſhe could not admit of theſe things, which 'tis manifeſt ſhe was conſcious were then firſt begun, and by the ſame evidence, they could be begun in no Age, but that of their author, Chriſt, by whom, ſince they are now received, 'tis very clear they were delivered.

See now how this will fit the *Jew*, whoſe Traditions, there being no ſuch principle to keep them out, may, for ought he can tell, be brought in in any Age, and whom in ſo ſuſpicious and fallacious a ſecrecie, as accompanied them, 'tis impoſſible ever to ſatisfie, that the Maſters he relies upon, either have not deceived him, or are not deceived themſelves.

¶ 8. *Thoſe Traditions, which went among the Jewiſh people for ſound Law,* (as Mr White *p.* 124.) *which the Phariſees taught*

taught them, have continued ſince with them, in their ſeveral Countries where they have been ſcattered; although they have no Sanhedrims, ſeeing they agree among themſelves in them, May they not prove, with your Argument, ſuch Traditions came from Moſes, *they have been handed ſtill to them from father to ſon, and that in divers places, ſo that they could not meet together to compoſe this forgerie: ſo that it is no ſuch impoſſible thing, as to leap over* Pauls *ſteeple (though* Mr White *&c.) as for your falſe Traditions to have firſt ſpread themſelves very largely and by degrees, and then being ſo ſpread to continue long, and yet to be falſe, there's example of its poſſibility in the Jews, and likewiſe in the Turks, &c.*

¶ 8. Here you argue in this manner: The Jews now, in the time of their diſperſion into ſeveral Countries, agree in thoſe falſe Traditions, which had formerly been taught them by the Phariſees, and which paſſed among them for ſound Law, therefore our diſcourſe proves they came from *Moſes.* Of which argument I doubt your Antecedent has more of confidence then ground: for where, or

how does this agreement of the ſcattered Jews to theſe Traditions appear? By as much as I can learn, from the ſmall commerce I have had my ſelf, and intelligence I could get from others, they are far enough from an uniformity in their opinions. Neither do I know their agreement is general in any thing, but what the natural force, there is in Tradition, preſerves in them, as the times and manners of celebrating their Feaſts, their circumciſion, the ornaments for their Synagogues and whatever elſe the obſtinacy of perpetual practice ſuffers them not to diſagree in. Now this ſeems ſo far from weakning, that it ſtrongly confirms the force of *Tradition*, which if it have, even unawares, ſuch an effect upon them, I do not ſee why it ſhould be denied its efficacy upon us.

You may perhaps think theſe things are preſerved by writing: But I conceive it follows not, that if a thing be written, it does not owe its preſervation to *Tradition*, and that both theſe things, and writing and all, have been preſerved by it. Nay, I beleeve that when you have examined the buſineſs well, you will find little

little agreement in any thing, whether written, or not, that does not proceed from this method. Though, were your Antecedent admitted, I do not see how it justifies your consequence. For though such an agreement may argue the dissent of what they agree in from the time of their dispersion, it will not reach one jot farther, nor afford any shew of reason, why some one of the *Rabbins*, in the intermedial Ages, betwixt *Moses* and the dispersion, may not have begun and dispersed the doctrine pretended to descend from *Moses*.

¶ 9. *One thing more I shall take notice of* p. 29. *where he defends your additions in Religion, an evident way both how error came into your Church, and spread it self over the whole face of it; by your authoritative determinations of new points not formalie (as you must confess) received at first, that which you determine once must stand as an infallible truth, and what wonder such spread themselves over that great part of Christendom, which you had set your selves over, seeing all that were under you, must receive all decisions from you for certainties, and those shall be derived to*

following Ages, and ſo Traditions of later date go for Apoſtolike. God forbids not the Doctors out of two truths delivered to gather a third, nor thoſe that are no Doctors to do the ſame if they can; but who gives the Doctors of your Church power to command their people to beleeve all their deciſions certainly true without any more adoe: Whether they be true or no it matters not, as long as they are uncertain to any one, he is not bound to beleeve them certainly true, §. 31. Mr White *demands whether the refuſer have a demonſtration againſt thoſe truths, he refuſeth to give abſolute aſſent unto? no, what then? muſt he therefore aſſent? Is it not a ſufficient ground not to aſſent? becauſe he has no ſufficient to aſſent? I think it is, and I pray do you ſhew the contrary, if I miſtake.*

¶ 10. *A hundred Mathematicians only tell me there is another world beſides this, juſt ſuch another; they are ſatisfied, but give me no ground to know the ſame; muſt I needs ſwear it is ſo, and aſſent to that I know not as a certain truth (thus you ſuffer your ſelves to be led by the noſes into a thouſand abſurdities) though the man by his probabilities is not to conclude raſhly all the Doctors determinations to be falſe,*

yet

yet though he had no probability against their decision, he must deny assent only upon this ground, that he has not sufficient evidence to conclude their determinations certain. I ask of you when a Council of yours meet, and from two truths received arrive at the discovery of a third Tenet; can the Council erre in this Deduction or no? I see no reason to say they cannot, there's no promise for it, they are all every one of them singly taken one by one fallible men as well as others. Nay, Mr White, p. 227. says they may, when he denies any Fathers saying, a sufficient proof of a point, no, (says he) not the chiefest of them, no not 300 of them together, for so many Bishops in a Council have erred; well then, it is possible they should err, though I will suppose it less probable, then that one man should erre, well but still it is possible they should err, and with what candor can Mr White call it an obstinate and malepert pride, not to subscribe to a fallible judgement, as infallible or certain, I call it blind folly to do it, must I beleeve that true, which I have no sufficient ground for, I have it not because their bare Assertions or judgement, who may be mistaken, are fallible, so then I should beleeve a lie

morally,

morally, if not logically, to me, though not in it self, because it is uncertain.

¶ 11. *Now consider, is this a trifle?* uno absurdo concesso mille sequuntur, *though the first uncertainty, which they concluded a certain truth, be but a smal falshood (as it is possible) afterwards more must needs follow being built upon the former, and so what wonder that Church swarms with Errors, where such a principle is admitted.*

Yet this way must be taken, the certain word of the eternal God, shall be thrown aside, and fallible men that are parties too in the cause shall ascend the throne, and make their word a Law, ther's difference between keeping quiet and not contradicting, and between being forced to subscribe to what a man knows not certainly, this is wickedness in them that force it, it is forcing often to sin, what is not of faith is sin. But besides, though Mr White *say one single man cannot have a demonstration against that which is determined true, though we suppose it rare, it is possible for one man to find out what all the world besides is ignorant of, as many have,* Mr Whites *own instance, of* Des Cartes *is sufficient, who found out more then many learned Clerks, with twice*

the

be poring, and will you force all to subscribe notwithstanding?

¶ 9, 10, 11. The Discourse in your following Paragraphs is strong, and worthy your self, and though by mistake of our Tenets, not concluding against us, yet full of excellently deduced truth. And first to defend *Mr White*, who only maintains the addition of Truths, why do you so confidently call that an evident way how Error might enter, and spread it self in the Church? Is Truth and Error all one? or does it follow that because men are content to admit of what they see to be true, they will not check at what they either see is false, or do not see is true? Will it ever follow out of Mr *Whites* Position, that there is no harm in adding of truths, that the mischief of adding errors cannot be avoided?

Now, because I conceive the mistake your whole Discourse runs upon, is occasioned by a wrong apprehension of the infallibility of Councils, I find it necessary to observe that, though some of our Doctors speak of Councils so indistinctly, that they beget such an opinion of their infallibility and authority, as I perceive you

you fancie, yet the beſt Divines, with whom Mr *White* agrees, do not allow any power in the Church of making new Articles of Faith, that is, of making that to be faith to day, which was not faith yeſterday, and the day before, and always, which it could not be, without being taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: whence 'tis evidently conſequent, that if they cannot make any new thing to be faith, neither can they oblige any to receive, and beleeve it, as faith. Their power therefore of impoſing Faith upon us (whatever fancies the confuſion of ſome Diſcourſes hath raiſed) extends no farther then to ſuch things as both were, and were known to be faith before their Impoſition: And ſure no danger can be ſuſpected from an Authority of commanding that which the whole world ſees whether they have authority to do or no. And ſo much for faith.

As for truths collected from Premiſes; Firſt, it appears they have no power to introduce them into the Catalogue of faith; I except ſuch as appear plainly at firſt ſight, and need no skill at all to their deduction, which, though in rigour

your they be not properly faith', are yet in a moral eſtimation accounted the ſame, and ſo by the world (which in ſuch plain things cannot be deceived) are indifferently beleeved. Secondly, A Council, being an Aſſembly of the learnedſt men in the Church, cannot be denied to ſee into conſequences far enough to know whether they be truly deduced or no; ſo that if they ingage for the truth, of any one, as it cannot be exalted into faith, ſo neither can it be imagined falls without ſome prejudice croſſing the diſpoſition of nature, which moves us to beleeve every one in his trade. Neither do I think, whatever you ſay of your hundred Mathematicians, in which ſcience being your ſelf a Maſter, to truſt is improper, but that if half a hundred Carpenters ſhould agree ſuch a peice of timber would fit ſuch a houſe, or as many Surveyers that ſuch a peece of ground contained ſo many Acres', your heart could not chuſe but think it true, what ever oppoſition the ſtrength of your wit might make againſt it: So that Mr *White* had reaſon to ſay, he that refuſes to beleeve the Church, if his thoughts be thoroughly

roughly sifted, will find in them a proud preference of his own private fancie, before the wisdom of the Christian world.

Nevertheless to comply with the wayward humours of her children, I beleeve she will exact no more in things of this nature, then a quiet submission, which your self cannot but see absolutely necessary for government, and a not opposition without evidence, leaving you the freedome of your inward thoughts, to assent no farther then you see reason (which yet if you be learned, you may have by looking into the reason her self goes upon, if you be unlearned, you have no reason for any principle that governs the most important of your actions of comparable weight to her authority) nay perhaps even to dissent, if a case contrivable onely, as I conceive, by a wild roving fancie, should be put actually to have been, *Viz.* That evidence be producible against her, so it be proposed with the moderation and submission necessary to the quiet and peace of all governments. since I hope this Explication of these points will rectifie the mistakes interwoven through your solid Discourses in these

Paragraphs.

Paragraphs. I ſhall without a more particular examination paſs on to the next Section.

Sect. II.

Authority of Fathers; Tranſubſtantiation.

¶ 1. *LEt us come to Particulars, Tranſubſtantiation, there cannot be a more abſurd Tenet imagined, that could be fuller of Contradictions, as plain as any contradiction in the world, that the Sun ſhould ſhine and not ſhine at the ſame time, that Chriſt ſhould begin to be, and not to be at the ſame time, broken and yet not broken at the ſame time, in one place, and yet in hundred thouſands; ſo many that you your ſelves are fain to look off, and confeſs you are not able to ſolve, yet for this what ground have you? the Word of God? No, your own Authors confeſs, you have no more cauſe to underſtand,* Hoc eſt corpus meum *literally, then thoſe the Lamb is the Paſſeover, Chriſt is a door, a rock, a way.*

¶ 1. Which oppoſes the point of

Transubstantiation, but so gently that the difficulties which you would have impossible to Omnipotency, are (almost) as familiar and ordinary events as any we converse with. But for the first, That Christ should begin to be, and not to be, how do you verifie either part? or infer from our doctrine there is a time when Christ is not? Which is necessary to the truth of your Proposition: Tis true, that this half hour he is not upon the Altar, the next he is; but sure it could not escape you, that, not to be upon the Altar, and not to be are two very different things. Now I am sure you do not wonder to see a Wart or Pimple to grow and perish; which nevertheless, while they live, have no distinct being from the being of the man they grow upon, that is, are that man, and yet cease to be, without causing the man to do so. And for those that follow, that Christ is broken, and not broken, in one place, and in ten thousand, pray consider that the multiplicity of forms our Saviour vouchsafes to put his sacred Body under, is to his body, as quantity or extension to substance. A man is but one thing and no more; his hands,

hands, his feet, and whatever else go to the making up of man, being not several things, but entring all into the unity of this truly one man; and this man by one of his feet is in one place, by another, not in that, but another place: Cut his hair, or nail, he is truly divided (that is, according to that part which is truly he) and truly remains one.

Now raise your thoughts, and consider how very little more faith this great mystery requires of you, no more then that you will permit the Author of nature to do that by the multitude of forms, with which he is pleased to cloth his body, which nature does every day by means of quantity, and see whether it be not very unjust (to say no more) to deny that to omnipotence, which the ordinary course of causes does so perpetually bring forth, that it never concerns your wonder, and seldom your notice. You will find some disparity in these similitudes, and so you must, for *nullum simile est idem*, but if I mistake not you will find the very knot of the difficulty the same in both, though the manner of tying be different; and however it be a

little reverence and ſubmiſſion to that power which extends to all things, ſhould eaſily prevail with us to beleeve, he is able to do more then we to comprehend.

For the reſt, in what you ſay we confeſs, *viz.* innumerable contradictions unſolvable, and which we are fain to look off from, certainly you muſt either miſtake our Authors or they themſelves: none, that underſtood what he ſaid, ever granting a true contradiction in this myſtery; neither do I beleeve they meant any more then that the depth of it is not to be fathom'd by the ſhortneſs of our underſtanding; a conceit, even to a moderate ſenſe, of that vaſt Abyſs of power, as well as wiſdom and goodneſs, ſo far from unreaſonable, that I know not how the contrary can be excuſed from impious. And for what you make our Authors ſay, that we have no more cauſe to underſtand the words of Conſecration literally, then other expreſſions acknowledged to be metaphorical; thoſe who truly ſay ſo [if there be any ſuch, which truly I much doubt] are then pitiful Authors; none, even among thoſe that are far from the deſert

desert of being Authors, being ignorant, That *Tradition* is the best Interpreter of Scripture, and that *it* teaches us to follow the letter in one place, and not in another.

¶ 2. *Have you derived this Interpretation all along from the Apostles? No your* Scotus *and* Bellarmine *confesse that,* Ante concilium Lateranse transubstantiatio non fui dogma fidei. *And as plain it is the first Ages of the Church, though they highly reverenced the Eucharist, and possibly by some hyperbolical expressions gave way to your Error, yet were cleerly against you.* Irenæus *l.* 4. *c.*34. Panis terrenus accepta vocatione à verbo Dei, non amplius est communis panis (*yet bread still*) sed efficitur eucharistica quæ constat ex duabus terrena (*therefore it is bread still*) & celesti. *Tertullian l.* 4. *contra Man.* Acceptum panem & distribuentem discipulis suis, corpus suum illum fecit: (*how?*) hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. *Basilius in Liturg. & Greg. Nazianz.* in orat. de pas. *both call the Bread and Wine* antitypa corporis Christi. *Ambros. de Sacram. l.* 4. *c.* 5. hæc oblatio est figura corporis & sanguinis domini. *Augus.*

contr. Adim. c. 12. Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum cum signum corporis sui daret; *And* Judam adhibuit convivium in quo corporis & sanguinis sui figuram discipulis suis commendavit & tradidit. Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerunq; etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est: sacramentum sanguinis Christi, sanguis Christi est; Ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Sicut ergo, cœlestis panis, qui caro Christi est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius *viz.* quod visibile, palpabile, mortale, in cruce positum est: vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: Sic sacramentum fidei, quo Baptismus intelligitur, fides est. *Theodoret Dialog.* 1. Servator certè noster nomina commutavit, & corpori quidem idem, quod erat symboli ac signi, nomen imposuit, symbolo autem,

autem, quod erat corporis. Causa mutationis manifesta est iis, qui sunt divinis mysteriis initiati: Volebat enim eos, qui sunt divinorum mysteriorum participes, non attendere naturam eorum quæ videntur sed propter nominum mutationem, mutationi quæ fit ex gratia credere. Qui enim quod natura est corpus, triticum & panem appellavit, & vitem seipsum rursus nominavit, is symbola, quæ videntur, appellatione corporis & sanguinis honoravit, non naturam quidem mutans, sed naturæ gratiam adjiciens. So Marius Monachus *sayes, the Bread and Wine are offered in the Church, as the Antitypes of his flesh and blood, and they that partake of the Bread which appears, do spiritually (not bodily then, as you grosly) eat the flesh of the Lord.*

From all those and many more I might name, I conclude that, instead of Mr Whites *malepertness*, page 31. *the contrary is a madness, seeing a man must shut his eyes first against the Sun, then obstinately resolve, come on it what will, to embrace not only uncertainties for certainties, but gross falshood for clear truth.*

¶ 2. You next make this Queſtion; *if we have derived this Interpretation all along from the Apoſtles?* which ſuppoſes the foundation of all our Doctrines to be an Interpretation of Scripture, a Poſition diſownd, as you know, by us; but if the Queſtion be, as I preſume you meant it, *Whether we have derived this Doctrine all along from the Apoſtles.* I anſwer yes, and appeal even to your ſelf, whether it were in the power of the Council of *Lateran*, which you generally take to be the firſt, which ſetled that doctrine, or any other authority upon the face of the earth, to impoſe, upon whoſe nations, tenets, damnable to themſelves and poſterity, and impoſſible not to be ſeen to be ſo; what is there beyond the power of humane nature, if this be not, That mankind, brought up in a beleef, that the Bleſſed Sacrament is no more then plain bread, made to ſignifie higher things indeed, but only to ſignifie them, ſhould of a ſudden unanimouſly run to Maſs, there adore the holy Sacrifice, and by vaſt Alms acknowledg it propitiatory for both quick and dead? Obſerve how ſlowly and warily the Council of *Trent* has been admitted into the

ſeveral

several Provinces of Christendom, into all which, even the Catholick ones, it has not yet, nor perhaps ever will, as to decrees of manners, gain'd an entire entrance, and confesse the nature of humane things endures not so extravagant a power, even in Councils, as to change the faith of the world, which it professes with this perswasion, that eternal happinesse depends upon it, according to an arbitrary determination, and that the making of a new word should make new truths, nay make that true to day which was false yesterday.

There Sir are impossibilities in nature, and may enter into a large fancy, but never passe from thence into a sober Judgement, nothing being more certain, then that, as great as the Power of a Council is, it is so far from being able to introduce a new faith with a new word, that it could never have introduced a new word which had not been found agreeable to the old faith.

Before I speak to your Fathers, who, you say, are so clear against us, give me leave to speak a little to your self; and put you in mind that you and I are now disputing

disputing, not of an obscure peece of Criticism, or unconcerning point of Philosophy, in which a mistake is of no greater concern than the credit of the mistaker, but of Religion, that is the way to Heaven, in which, if we misse, we have the same hopes of comming thither, that he has of getting to his journeys end by night who travels all day in a wrong road. Our Souls therefore, and their Salvation being concerned in this conteſt, no plea ought to be produced but such a one, of whose efficacy we are so far perswaded as to venture them upon it.

Now by the great candor you profess, have the Fathers you cite, so much authority with you? are you content so to submit your judgement to theirs, as, when it appears what the path is they walked in, to quit all others for it, and constantly pursue it to eternity? such, and only such a disposition may make the pains requisite to so great an effect, as clearing the sence of the Fathers in all points of controversy, rationally charitable: but if you have it not, the whole businesse is turn'd into a wit-combat, and

the

the Question no more but this, whether of us two are better vers'd in Antiquity? and truly, me thinks, the concern of eternity deserves to be treated a little more seriously, then, if what is alleaged, prove true, nothing is advanced, if false, nothing lost; which yet I take to be your case; for if the Fathers say, as you would have them, you professe not to rely upon them, if otherwise, not to regard them.

But I am afraid your manner of treating the Fathers is more liable to exceptions, then your treating them. For, (to omit the want of rigorous exactnesse in some of your Testimonies, which uses to accompany those citations which are perfectly your own,) you have brought a Quotation from S. *Austin*, which you make look like an entire Text, that proves, when examined, a collection of several sentences, some not so much as his, scattered through several books, in several Tomes, and cite for it a book never written, at least by him. This proceeding, I dare say, is not yours, and I would intreat you, since you refuse to rely upon the Fathers, not to hazard your

your own, or eternal happineſſe, or eternal miſery, upon the credit of, you know beſt whom, but in all likelyhood, (beſides their being men, that is, in your principles, not to be rely'd on, becauſe fallible) engaged by intereſt or affection into a partiality, which ſhould be more ſuſpicious to you, then the bare fallibility of ſuch men as the Fathers; and whoever they be, I may ſafely ſay, not comparable either in learning or virtue to thoſe great ornaments of the Church of God. If ever you think fit to look into them, take my counſel, and look with your own, not other mens eyes; 'Tis your ſelf are concerned; and I conceive it injuſtice to yield a ſubmiſſion to any body elſe, which you deny the Fathers; Next do not only read them, by ſtarts I mean, as an occaſional citation invites you, but ſtudy them, and perſevere with diligence from the beginning to the end of that piece you deſire to be Maſter of; and then if you be truly unprejudic'd, and bring a willingneſſe to embrace what you find, I am as confident you will find the truth this way, as I think it extreamly difficult, not to ſay impoſſible,

impossible, you should come to it by any other.

It would perhaps, not have been improper to consider a little in this place the nature of Arguments drawn from *Fathers*; for neither do we hold this consequence necessary; A father affirms this, therefore this is true. But having been already longlonger then I intended, give me leave to refer you for that point to Mr *Whites Controversie Logick*, and only propose you this short reflexion; that since a Father is a Father, in as much as he propagates that kind in which he is a Father, that is in our case, the Church, and the Church is a company of faithful, and who are *faithful*, is to be known by the *rule of faith*, that point must first be setled, before any claim can be made either to Father, or Church, since without it you can neither affirm of any man that he is a Father, nor of any company of men, that 'tis a Church.

Farther, since a Father as such, is not a Doctor or deducer of Consequences, (for so every Doctor of Divinity would be a Father) nor a Homilist, nor Commentator, for the same reason, you will find the word,

ſtrictly look'd into, imports a propagator of Chriſtian faith, by witneſſing what the Church held in the time for which he witneſſeth; but ſo as that the witneſs, by reaſon either of his eminency in learning, dignity of place, or both, or by being an avowed Champion of the Churches Doctrine againſt her enemies cannot be conceived ignorant of the Churches ſence in his days. To go therefore properly to work, your Teſtimonies from Fathers, ſhould be from men thus qualified, ſpeaking as witneſſes, the words, though of the ſame men, if under other capacities, being not properly the words of Fathers, but of Schollers, Preachers, or what other capacity they ſpeak in. And to theſe juſt bounds, would you, as you ought confine your quotations, alas, how ſmall a ſhew would Antiquity afford you? perhaps not four in her whole extent. Your preſent appearance will, I doubt, by this reflexion, be diſcovered to be made out of falſe Muſters; nevertheleſs in condeſcendence to you, let us now examine what you ſay, and let me wonder what you ſay; firſt, *viz.* That the firſt Ages were clearly againſt

us. Pray what have you, or can you have to justifie an Assertion of that sound? perhaps you will say the writings of these times. But I should think that those who do not write, are infinitely more considerable in number, and no lesse in value, then those who do; and do not believe you can assign a reason why the Title and credit of so glorious a title as an Age should be taken from them who certainly best deserve it, but of whose sense you have no account at all, to be given to those few who have given an account of their sence, but do not at al deserv the title.

Again, even of those few who have written, how many are lost, and never descended down to us, who for any thing we know to the contrary, may not have been of the same opinion with those whose writings we have. If I should write now, and you write against me, but so as my Book have the fortune to be preserved, yours not: Will you not think the Age wrong'd, if a thousand years hence they conclude that to be the sence of it which they find in my Book? Cast up your accounts therefore faithfully, and you will find the sum total

of your Age to be two or three Writers in every hundred years, who are ſo far from making the ſence of the firſt Ages to be againſt us (for they are of our ſide too) that they do not ſo much as make it appear what it was: Yet ſince you ſeem to put a confidence in them, let us ſee to whom they will be more favourable.

Your firſt from *Irenæus*, we look upon as ſo far from being clearly againſt us, that we uſe to produce it on our behalf; conceiving it expreſſes very clearly that what was common Bread before conſecration, does by vertue thereof (*accepta vocatione*) ceaſe to be what it was, and becomes Euchariſt, in which are both earthly qualities, colour, taſte, *&c.* and heavenly ſubſtance, the body of Chriſt. A ſecond view will, I am confident, ſhew you this to be the ſence of the place, and cauſe you to agree in this particular with *Luther*, who, in his *Defenſ. verb. Cæn.* is of opinion that the *vocare Dei* did make the things to be vvhat they vvere called, and that *Irenæus* uſed the word in that ſence.

The next from *Tertullian* is accompanied with as great, though a more eaſie miſtake; his obſcurity being very often

not

not penetrable but to laborious and obſtinate induſtry; but if you pleaſe to look upon the place and throughly conſider it, you will find his meaning was, not that this, which he ſays our Saviour made his body: was only a figure of his body, but that what anciently was a figure of his body, he then made his body, for his whole deſign being to prove that our Saviour fulfilled the figures of the Old Teſtament, the place objected provs particularly the fulfilling that of Bread which being by the Prophet, *conjiciamus lignum in panem ejus*, uſed for a Figure of his body, he ſays is the reaſon why he took rather Bread then any other thing to change into his ſacred body.

The following ones, all but *Theodoret*, have the ſame difficulty, all witneſſing the Bleſſed Euchariſt to be an Antitype a figure, a ſign, *&c.* of the body and blood of Chriſt; and that it is ſo, and uſually, and well called ſo, we agree; but that the Fathers ever meant it ſo a Figure, or ſign as to exclude the thing ſignified, we deny, and conceive it impoſſible you ſhould prove. In what ſenſe

they called it so you may, if you please, learn from the last words of your Testimony attributed by you to S. *Austin contra Didim.* who never wrote any such Book that I know of, but found in the Canon, *Hoc est de Consecr.* and said indeed to be taken out of him. These now affirm the consecrated Bread to be truly the flesh of Christ, and yet a Sacrament also, or sign of his Body. How? observe, *illius*, viz. *quod visibile palpabile mortale in cruce positum est*; that is, this body now immortal, now invisible signifies or brings into our mind this same body as mortal, as visible, &c. being it self in a different form a sign of it self. *Vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis* the sacrifice, mark you, of what? Of flesh) *quæ sacerdotis manibus fit*, that is, the Mass, *Christi passio &c. non rei veritate sed significante mysterio*; for the Priest does not truly crucifie, truly kill our Saviour, but mistically represent to us by sacrificing his now impassible body, that great, and onely once performed Sacrifice offered upon the Cross in the same body when passible. Both actions, truly Sacrifice, both Victims, truly body, and the same body,

but

but one, under one form, a Sacrament, or sign of it self under another.

Now that the same thing in a different relation, may be a sign, or figure, or image of it self, I hope will not appear strange to you, if you reflect, that *God the Son is the image of his Fathers substance, and the same substance was made into the likeness of man, and yet truly man,* &c. And your Argument, 'tis a sign or figure, therefore not substance, is common to you with the *Marcionites*, who argued Christ, because in image, therefore not in truth a servant, no man, because in likeness a man; and because in figure, therefore not in substance a man; for which they are reprehended and confuted by *Tertullian lib.* 5. *cont. Marc. c.* 20. So that your Argument, were it good, proves more then you intended, and perhaps imagined, and not onely takes away our Saviours bodie from the blessed Eucharist, but leaves him none to take away; for certainly the same Argument is the same, whether in *Marcions* mouth or in yours, and there is no remedy but you must either relinquish it, or cannot relinquish him. In short what wonder,

that

that it is called a ſign, when it cannot be a Sacrament without being ſo? all our Queſtion is, Whether it be a meer ſign? This the Teſtimonies ſhould *expreſs*, and not leave to the Readers gloſs.

There remains *Theodoret*, ſaying, *the nature is not changed, but grace added to it.* Bnt what is meant by *nature*, then which a more equivocal word ſeldom occurs, is the Queſtion. In our ordinary ſpeech very often, and in the Fathers moſt frequently, the proper qualities of a thing uſe to be called natural, and nature; and that *Theodoret* meant no more by the word here, (*viz.* that the nature, that is, the taſte, colour, ſhape, *&c.* of bread was not changed) I am induced to beleeve, both from this very place, which tells us we are not to look to the nature, or outward appearances of what is ſeen, but for the change of names, to beleeve the change made by grace, which change I conceive to be a real, not moral onely change, of ſubſtance, not office; ſince then the Bread by conſecration ſhould become a ſign of Chriſts body (which if you will beleeve *Tertullian* it was before) is no ſuch myſte-

rie

rie as to deserve a change of names to require our faith, and be manifest onely *mysteriis initiatis*. But more by what he says in his *second Dialogue*, where he plainly tells us the mystical signs are understood to be that which they are made, and are beleeved, and *adored* as being the things which they are beleeved. Now what think you, was *Theodoret* of your opinion that maintains such a change by vertue of consecration as brings in adoration with it? May bread be adored, let it signifie what it will? unquestionably therefore, he held such a change as made the bread to be no longer bread, but a fit object of adoration. And that it may appear the rest of the Fathers were of his mind, and the interpretation, I make of their sayings, not obtruded upon them, but purely their own true sentiments: I shall present you with a short taste of their judgment, leaving you in case it stir your appetite to desire it, for a fuller meal, to the large store of their own writings, which if you please to fall upon, I am confident you cannot bring a hunger, which will not meet with full satietie.

S. Am-

S. Ambrof. de iis qui myſt. init. c. 9. *Quantis igitur utimur exemplis ut probemus non hoc eſſe quod natura formavit, ſed quod benedictio conſecravit, majoremque eſſe vim benedictionis quam naturæ.* How many examples therefore do we uſe to prove it is not what nature framed, but what the bleſſing has conſecrated, and that the force of the bleſſing is greater then that of nature. And in his Treatiſe de Sacram. l. 4. cap. 5. *Antequam conſecretur panis eſt, ubi autem verba Chriſti acceſſerint corpus eſt Chriſti.* Again, *& ante verba Chriſti calix eſt vini & aquæ plenus, ubi verba Chriſti operata fuerint ibi ſanguis efficitur qui plebem redemit. Ergo videte quantis generibus potens eſt ſermo Chriſti univerſa convertere. Deinde ipſe Dominus Jeſus teſtificatur nobis quod corpus ſuum accipiamus & ſanguinem, nunquid debemus de ejus fide & teſtificatione dubitare?* Before conſecrated, it is bread; as ſoon as the words of Chriſt are added, it is the body of Chriſt. Again, and before the words of Chriſt, it is a Chalice full of Wine and Water, as ſoon as the words of Chriſt have operated, bloud is made there, that bloud which redeemed the people. Behold therefore how many ways powerful the ſpeech of Chriſt is to change

all

all things. Moreover our Lord Jesus himself testifies to us that we do receive his body and bloud; is it for us to doubt of his credit and witness?

S. Greg. Nyss. orat. Catec. cap. 37. *Oportet considerare quomodo fieri potuerit, ut unum illud corpus, quod tam multis fidelium millibus in universo orbe terrarum semper distribuitur, totum per partem sit in unoquoque, & ipsum in se totum maneat.* Which having discoursed, he concludes, *Hæc autem dat virtute benedictionis in illud transelementata eorumque apparent natura.* We are to consider how it could come to pass, that that one body which is perpetually distributed to so many thousands of faithful through the whole world, is whole in every one in particular, and remains whole in it self. But these things he gives by vertue of the blessing, having transelemented, the nature of those things which appear unto it. And *Orat. 1. de Resur. Qui enim potestate sua cuncta disponit, non ex proditione sibi impendentem necessitatem, non Judæorum quasi prædonum impetus, non inquam Pilati sententiam expectat ut eorum malitia sit communis hominum salutis principium & causa; sed consilio suo antevertit, & arcano*

sacrificii

sacrificii genere quod ab hominibus cerni non poterat, seipsum pro nobis hostiam offert, & victimam immolat, sacerdos simul existens, & agnus Dei, ille qui mundi peccatum tollit. Quando id præstitit? cum corpus suum discipulis congregatis edendum, & sanguinem bibendum præbuit, tunc aperte declaravit agni sacrificium jam esse perfectum. For he, who by his power disposes all things, doth not expect the necessity now neerly approaching from his betraying, expects not to be set upon by the Jews like Theeves, expects not, I say, the sentence of *Pilate*, that their malice may be the beginning and cause of the common safetie of mankind: but by his providence prevents them, and by a hidden kinde of sacrifice, which could not be discerned by men, offers himself an Host for us, and immolates a Victim, being *himself* both Priest and Lamb of God, that *Lamb* which takes away the sin of the world. When did he perform this? when he gave his bodie to be eaten, and blood to be drunk, to his Disciples gathered together, then he openly declared the Sacrifice of the Lamb to be now accomplished.

S.

S. Hierom. ep. ad Hedib. q. 2. *Nec Moyses dedit nobis panem verum, sed Dominus Jesus ipse conviva & convivium ipse comedens & qui comeditur.* Neither did *Moses* give us the true bread but our Lord Jesus; himself both guest and banquet, himself both eating and eaten.

Cyril. Al. l. 10. in Joan. c. 13. *Non tamen negamus recta nos fide charitateque sincera Christo spiritualiter conjungi, sed nullam nobis conjunctionis rationem secundum carnem ejus illo esse, id profecto pernegamus idque à divinis scripturis omnino alienum dicimus. An fortassis putat ignotam nobis mystice benedictionis virtutem esse, quæ quum in nobis fiat, nonne corporaliter quoque facit communicatione carnis Christi, Christum in nobis habitare. Unde considerandum est non habitudine solum quæ per charitatem intelligitur, Christum in nobis esse, verum etiam & participatione naturali. Non credis mihi hæc dicenti Christo, te obsecro, fidem præbe.* Nevertheless we do not deny that we are joyned spiritually to Christ, by a right faith and sincere charity, but that we are not at all joyned to him according to the flesh, that we utterly deny, and affirm it to be altogether against the Divine Scriptures,

pturcs. Does he think we are ignorant of the efficacie of the myſtical bleſſing, which when it is performed in us, doth it not make Chriſt dwell in us even corporally too by communication of the fleſh of Chriſt? Whence is to be conſidered that Chriſt is in us, not habitually onely, that is, by charity, but alſo by a natural participation too. You beleeve not me in theſe matters; I beſeech you beleeve Chriſt. *Cyril Hier cat. myſt. 4. Cum igitur Chriſtus ipſe ſic affirmet, atque dicat de pane, hoc eſt corpus meum: Quis deinceps audeat dubitare? ac eodem quoque confirmante & dicente, hic eſt ſanguis meus: Quis inquam dubitet, & dicat non eſſe illius ſanguinem; aquam aliquando mutavit in vinum, quod eſt ſanguini proſinquum, in Cana Galileæ ſola voluntate; & non erit dignus cui credamus quod vinum in ſanguinem tranſmutaſſet. Ne ergo conſideres tanquam panem nudum, & vinum nudum: Corpus enim eſt & ſanguis Chriſti ſecundum ipſius Domini verba, quamvis enim ſenſus hoc tibi ſuggerit, tamen fides te confirmet, ne ex guſtu rem judices, quin potius habeas ex fide pro certiſſimo, ita ut nulla ſubeat dubitatio, eſſe tibi donata corpus & ſanguinem. Hæc ſciens, & pro certiſſimo habens*

panem hunc qui videtur, non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, sed esse corpus Christi; & vinum quod à nobis conspicitur tametsi sensui gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum sed sanguinem esse Christi. Since therefore Christ himself affirms it, & says of Bread, *This is my body*, who dares from thenceforth doubt it? himself also confirming and saying, *This is my bloud*; who, I say, is there can doubt, and say it is not his bloud? In *Cana* of *Galilee*, he did heretofore by his onely will change water into wine, which approaches to bloud; and will he become not worthy to be beleeved that he has changed wine into bloud? Do not therefore consider it as bare bread and bare wine, for according to the words of our Lord himself, it is the body and bloud of Christ; for although sense do suggest this unto thee, yet let faith confirm thee, that thou do do not judge of the thing by thy taste, but rather hold by faith for most certain, so that there be no place for doubt that what is given thee is body and bloud. Knowing this, and holding for most certain, that this Bread which is seen is not Bread, although the taste judge it to be

so, but the Body of Christ, and the Wine which is seen by us, although to the sense of taste it seem Wine, yet is not Wine, but the bloud of Christ.

S. Aug. Ep. 162. *Tolerat ipse Dominus Judam, Diabolum, funem, & venditorem suum, sinit accipere inter innocentes discipulos, quod fideles noverunt pretium nostrum.* And in *Psal.* 33. con. 1. *Ferebatur in manibus suis. Hoc vero fratres quomodo posset fieri in homine, quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur manibus suis? manibus aliorum potest portari homo, manibus suis nemo portatur. Quomodo intelligatur in ipso David secundum literam non invenimus, in Christo autem invenimus; ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando commendamus ipsum corpus suum, ait, hoc est corpus meum* Our Lord himself endures *Judas* a Devil, a Thief, who sold him; he suffers him to receive amongst his innocent Disciples that which the faithful know to be our price. Again upon these words of *Psal.* 33. And he was carried in his own hands. But this brethren, how it may be verified in man, who can understand? for who is carried in his own hands? in the hands of another, a man may be carried, no man is carried in his own.

own. How this may literally be understood of *David* we do not find; of Christ we do, for Christ was carried in his own hands, when recommending his own very body, he said, *This is my body.*

S. Chrys. in Matth. 26. Hom. 83. *Credamus itaque ubique Deo, nec repugnemus ei, etiamsi sensui, & cogitationi nostræ absurdum esse videatur quod dicit: superet sensum & rationem nostram sermo ipsius, quod in omnibus, & præcipue in mysteriis faciamus, non illa quæ ante nos jacent solummodo aspicientes, sed verba quoque ejus tenentes; nam verbis ejus defraudari non possumus, sensus vero noster deceptui facillimus est; illa fallere non possunt, hic sæpius atque sæpius fallitur; Quoniam ergo ille dixit; hoc est corpus meum: nulla teneamur ambiguitate, sed credamus, & oculis intellectus id perspiciamus. Non enim quod modo dicunt vellem formam & speciem ejus, vellem vestimenta ipsa, vellem calceamenta videre; ipsum igitur vides, ipsum tangis, ipsum comedis. Venit tibi in mentem quo sis honore honoratus, qua mensa fruaris, ea namque re nos alimur quam Angeli videntes tremunt, nec absque pavore, propter fulgorem qui inde resilit, aspicere possunt.* Let us therefore believe God and not

not withstand him, although what he says seem absurd to our sence and understanding; let his words surmount both our sense and our reason, & this let us do in all things, and principally in the mysteries, not looking only upon those things which lie before us, but minding also his words, for by them we cannot be deceived, 'tis very easie to impose upon our sence: 'Tis not possible they should be false, this is deceived over & over again, since therefore he has said, *This is my body*, let us not doubt at all but beleeve and look upon it, with the eies of our understanding. O how many are there now who say I would fain see his shape and beauty, nay but his cloths, his shooes? why thou seest his own self, toucheſt himself, eateſt himself: Consider what an honour it is which is done thee, at what a Table thou art fed, for we are nourished with that very thing which the Angels tremble in beholding, and are not able to look upon without dread for the glory which issues from it.

And *Hom.* 24. on 1 *Cor.* *Id quod est in calice, est id quod fluxit è latere, & illius sumus participes. Hoc carnes etiam jacens*

in

in præsepi, reveriti sunt magi. And, cum multo metu & tremore adorarunt: Tu autem non in præsepi vides, sed in altari; non femineam eum tenentem, sed sacerdotem assistentem. Nos ergo ipsos excitemus, & formidemus, & longe majorem quam illi Barbari ostendamus reverentiam. That which is in the Chalice is that which did flow from the side, and of that we are partakers. The wise men did reverence to this body lying even in a Crib, with much fear and trembling adored it: But thou seest it, not in the Crib, but on the Altar; thou seest not a woman holding him, but a Priest assisting: Let us therefore stir up our selves and fear, and shew much more reverence then those barbarous men.

Again, Hom. 17. ad Heb. Eundem enim semper offerimus: non nunc quidem alium, sed semper eundem. Quoniam multis in locis offertur, multine sunt Christi? nequaquam, sed unus ubique Christus; qui & hic est plenus, & illic plenus unum corpus: Pontifex noster ille est qui illam obtulit hostiam quæ nos mundat. Illam nunc quoque offerimus quæ tunc fuit oblata; quæ non potest consumi. For we always offer up the same; not another, even at this time, but the same; because he is offered

offered (*or sacrificed*) in many places, are there therefore many Christs? by no means, but one Christ every where: who is entire here, entire there, one bodie. He is our Bishop who offered, that Host which cleanseth us: We also do now offer that Host which then was offered, which cannot be consumed. And *lib.* 3. *de Sacerd. c.* 4. *O miraculum! O Dei benignitatem! qui cum patre sursum sedet in illo ipso temporis articulo omnium manibus pertractatur, ac se ipse tradit volentibus ipsum excipere ac complecti.* O miracle! O goodness of God! He, who sits with his Father above, is in the same instant of time, handled by us all, and himself gives himself to those who are willing to receive and imbrace him.

I shall conclude with two, but those so evidently express in the point of Adoration, that they seem of themselves enough to conclude the Controversie. The First is from *S. Ambrose* l. 3. de spir. sanct. c. 12. *Itaque per scabellum terra intelligatur, per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysteriis adoramus, & quam Apostoli in Domino Jesu, ut supra diximus adorarunt:* By a footstool therefore let

earth

earth be underſtood, by earth the fleſh of Chriſt, which even at this day, we *adore* in the myſteries, and which the Apoſtles, as I ſaid before, adored in our Lord Jeſus.

The next from S. *Auſtin*, explicating the ſame words in *Pſal.* 98. *Suſcepit enim de terra terram, quia caro de terra eſt, & de carne Mariæ carnem accepit; & quia in ipſa carne hic ambulavit, & ipſam carnem nobis manducandam ad ſalutem dedit, nemo autem illam carnem manducaverit, niſi prius adoraverit, Invenimus eſt quomodo adoretur ille ſcabellum pedum Domini, & non ſolum non peccemus adorando, ſed peccemus non adorando.* For of earth he took earth, becauſe fleſh is of earth; and of the fleſh of *Mary* he took fleſh; and becauſe he walked here in that fleſh, and gave us that fleſh to be eaten unto ſalvation, and none eats that fleſh without having firſt adored it; We have found how ſuch a footſtool of the feet of our Lord may be adored, and how we do not only not ſin in adoring it, but ſin in not adoring it.

Theſe few I have choſen out of many, enough, I hope to ſatisfie you, that 'tis very far from plain, that the firſt Ages were

were cleerly against us. And that those whose forward confidence has perswaded you to think so, have very much wronged the confidence you put in them; it being not possible, for our selves at this day, to express more plainly then those great lights of the Church have done before us: That *our senses are not in this matter, to be trusted; that they may, but the Word of God cannot deceive us; that what we see in the blessed Eucharist is not what nature framed; not Bread and Wine, though to our senses it seem so, but the body and blood of Christ, that blood which redeemed the people, that very thing which did flow from his side; which the Sages saw and adored in the manger; that at which the Angels, in beholding, tremble, nor are able to look upon without fear; that which no man received without first adoring, and which, in fine, 'tis sin not to adore.*

Sect. III.

Prayer to Saints.

BUt to proceed, page 103. Mr. White strives to answer the Objection of Prayer

Prayer to Saints, alleged as an Innovation, & so a proof of the uncertainty of Traditions, and their corruptions: the first Argument from the opinion of the Fathers, who held that the souls of Saints were not admitted into heaven before the day of Judgment, Mr. White only says, he does not believe it their opinion, but he should have proved they did not, I wish the Arguments brought were set down by Mr. White, but supposing they held Saints were not admitted, he sees no consequence, which I exceedingly wonder at, what? Eagle-eyed Mr. White not see it? No wonder indeed, when he changes the very question, which with what ingenuitie it is done, I leave to you his friend to judge: the Question was in the first line of the page, Prayer to Saints, he says suppose they were not, may they not nevertheless pray for us? I pray Mr. White, Is there not a great vast difference between these two, the Saints pray for us, and we may pray to the Saints, suppose the Saints not yet in heaven pray for us, the Church of God in general, not knowing every ones particular condition, may they not do it without Superstition or Idolatry? For a particular man here, may and should pray for the welfare of the Church be-

yond

yond Sea, but can the Church beyond Sea, all the members of it, in whatsoever place or time by night or day, pray unto the particular man here in England, *to pray to God for them, without Idolatry, seeing the man here they all pray to must know the prayers they make whether by night or by day, whether he be asleep or awake, whether many of them pray together in several places, or onely one at once, and is it not Idolatry? Suppose every man of you in* England, *upon every occasion you had should pray to the Pope, to get help for you from God; one in this Town is a praying for health; another at the same hour in* Wales *for deliverance from Robbers, another at midnight, when the Pope is asleep, prays for pardon of sin, I think you will say this is Idolatry, making a God of a man, whom you suppose by praying, to hear and know your particular conditions; but it is a quite other matter, if the Pope should pray for all of you in general, (as we do for the whole Church) though he knew not your particular wants: The Consequence then which admirable* Mr. White *cannot see, is strong and good, for if you grant the Fathers held Saints were not admitted into heaven, they held*

hold they were not to be prayed unto; because before admission, they could not know every mans condition, that laid it open to them in prayer; what say you? could they not yet be admitted, know every mans condition or not? If not, why doe you pray to them that cannot hear you? If they know (which Mr. White seems to hold in bringing Jeremiah *praying for the people) then indeed the Consequence is not forcing, and indeed unlesse Mr. White think so, he does but fumble, as bad as your Seraphim of Divines (so yours call* Aquinas) *about this very question, which by reason of the badness of his Tenet contradicts himself in the compass of two leaves.*

¶ 1. This Section treats of Prayer to Saints, and the first Paraph is imployed in making good a consequence, which you acknowledge little importing whether true or no, since Mr. *Whites* second Answer is, as you confess, that which he relies upon, nay which you acknowledg to be not forcing, that is not good, and none in that opinion which Mr. *White* maintains for true, *Viz.* That

Saints even before admission into Heaven know every mans condition. I cannot tell therefore whether reason will justifie my pains in examining, what before I begin is confessed to be nothing to the purpose; and yet the bitter confidence of your close, which calls Mr. *White's* Discourse *trifles*, and *signs of a rotten cause*, &c. prevails with me to let you see those terms do not become an Argument, whose Premises besides being untrue, are also many ways nothing to the purpose.

First then I observe, that in the very place you charge Mr. *White* with want of ingenuity, you would have much ado to defend your self, from a severe Adversary; pray, if I should urge it, what reason could you assign of changing his Objection, That divers Fathers held non-admission before the day of judgement, into this expression, that the Fathers held it, which signifies all, or the universality of them, his importing but a few. But, though you give me occasion I will not be rigorous, and proceed to tell you, 'tis both unjust and irrational,

nal, to exact the proof you do. Let those prove the Fathers hold the opinion, who say they did, else a bare denial is a sufficient Confutation of a bare Assertion; the proof as you know very well, belonging to the Plaintiff, not Defendant. But besides Mr. *White* disclaims medling with the point, and 'tis a strange severity in you to quarrel at the want of a proof where there is not so much as an Argument, and to be angry for not finding what you are told beforehand is not there to find; yet if your curiosity persevere, you may, if you please, see the ground of Mr. *Whites* opinion in his *Middle state of Souls, Act.* 4.

In the mean time we must see what is to be said to the alteration you accuse him to have made of the Question: which first, I will hope, you look not upon as design, for no man plays foul play but for advantage, and 'tis the same thing to him whether Saints hear us, or hear us not before admission. You see he maintains the opinion of non-admission to be false, and therefore cannot be concerned what happens, in case it be, for argument sake, supposed true.

Next, though it ſeem but odly ſpent time, which is imployed in gueſſing, and beſides himſelf no body can do more, at the reaſon of the accident, yet I beleeve from the experience I have of him, I may confidently affirm this paſſage to be one of thoſe obſcurities, which his great intentiveneſs upon ſence, and ſmall care of expreſſion makes every body complain of in him. Neither is this the firſt time that his overmuch minding the thing he would diſcourſe of, has made him forget ſom link neceſſary to the chain of his diſcourſe; which had it been made in this manner, the Saints whether admitted or not admitted, may pray for us, and do know whether we pray to them, therefore the Objection is of no force; your ſelf would have, and have allowed.

Now that ſecond Propoſition is to him ſo clear a truth, holding that our blindneſs here is from the cloud of matter which darkens every thing, and which the ſoul being freed from, finds no obſcurity impenetrable to her natural activity, that he never reflected or her people would find a difficulty where himſelf ſaw none; I beg leave therefore to add it for him, and

undertake to defend it against the assaults your next Paraph makes upon it; though I apprehend my self not otherwise oblig'd to so much, then by the desire I have to proceed according to the rules, not of strict disputation, but civility: For would I insist upon it, how could you justifie your cleer-sightedness, and this consequence, which, though Mr. *White* could not, you saw was good; if the Fathers held non-admission, they held no prayer? because, say you, they knew not, before admission every mans condition. This you see I have denied; but, put case I had not, I am afraid you would come short of your account.

S. *Austin* and other Fathers are alledged by *Veron*, an excellent French Controvertist, to maintain prayer to Saints, even while they doubted whether these Saints heard the prayers made to them; And you may reflect, that prayer to Saints, is a part of *Tradition* rivetted into our hearts by an universal and undeniable practise; but whether souls, freed from the commerce of bodies, receive intelligence of what passes among bodies; and this again either from the nature of their

ſtate, or divine revelation: Whether the return of our prayers to Saints be from their mediation, or only from the goodneſs of God making uſe of our affection to creatures like our ſelves, to give us thoſe benefits, which otherwiſe we had never demanded, and ſo never received, and the like, are School queſtions, in which ſpeculative wits, according to the difference of their learning and ſtudie, have met with either truth or error, but acting all the while as Schollers, and never doubting the lawfulneſs of the practice, which occaſioned all theſe diſputes, and which they ſaw firmly ſetled upon a more ſolid foundation then all their School-learning, for had they done ſo, they had diſputed it, as well as the reſt.

To take then all parts of your Argument, tis falſe, the Fathers held non-admiſſion is falſe, that non-admiſſion imports ignorance of our condition; laſtly, tis falſe, that non admiſſion and ignorance both of them exclude prayers to Saints, that is, in the Fathers judgement (for the Queſtion is not what is true or falſe, but what they held to be ſo) ſince they prayed to them even then when they

doubted

doubted whether they were heard or no. Now I beseech you reflect, if to reject such arguments be a sign of a rotten cause, what it is to be perswaded by them, and perswaded in matters of no less concern then eternity?

¶ 2. *Suppose that be Mr. Whites meaning; the Saints know what we pray to them before they are admitted into heaven, is that your Tenet? To what purpose else does he bring Jeremies praying in the Macchabees, to say that he prays in general (as we do for the whole Church, though we know not its particular state) is nothing to the purpose, the Question is, Whether we may pray to the Saints, and in order to our praying to them, whether they can know every particular mans prayer; if you say they do, you and your Apocriphal Book, contradict the undoubted Word of God, by his Prophet, Isai. 63. 16. Abraham knows us not, and Israel is ignorant of us, which your S. Thomas can no otherwise solve, then by imagining the Saints before Christ were not yet admitted to Heaven.*

¶ 2. Here comes your convincing, as you think, Argument against the knowledg of Saints, from the Prophet *Isaiah*; *Abraham knows us not, and Israel is ignorant of us*:

us: but I would beg of you not to put so much confidence in words without a full mastery of their sense; for 'tis the sense of Scripture is truly *Scripture*. You have found indeed the word *ignorant*, and *knows me not*, but what is meant by that word, (and what that *is*, is the whole difficulty) you settle not. You know that word, *Luke* 13. 25, 27. is applied to the Master of the House, *Mat.* 25. 12. to the Bridegroom; and I hope you will not, from it, argue any ignorance in that Master, and that Bridegroom, *Mark* 13. 32. The knowledge of the day of judgment is denied to that Son, who being so man that he is also God, cannot, sure, at any time be imagined to want his omniscience. Since therefore 'tis manifest those words have in Scripture many senses, what possibility is there by the bare sound without further inquisis to conclude any one? The Contexe, and your own later Translations, which for *ignorant* put *acknowledg not*, perswade me they have here the same sense, as when God is said not to know impious persons. But 'tis not for me to prove, but to shew you have not done so;

so; and in the mean time to wonder so excellent a wit should make such a bravado with a Bulrush, which nevertheless I impute to the weakness of your cause, whose armory affords no better weapons.

¶ 3. *That which Mr. White proves out of the parable of Dives, praying to Abraham, is as ridiculous, for if it be a proof, it is either nothing to the Question, or contrary to that Scripture named. But the principal answer (for the former are but trifles, signs of a rotten cause) Saints are admitted to Heaven before the day of Judgment, therefore seeing God, and so all things, know our prayers, and so fit to be prayed unto. But seeing this naked, groundless, not proved Assertion, is the principal answer, how chance not a word to the Argument that prevented and utterly destroyed it, the Fathers did hold the contrary? Is this a satisfaction to the Argument, only to say I do not believe it? Be Judge your self and give a better.*

¶ 3. You call Mr. *White's* touch upon the Parable of *Dives* ridiculous, and say 'tis either nothing to the Question, or contrary to the Scripture named; but since you do no more then say so, you will pardon me if I have not that captivation

vation of my understanding to your words, which you refuse the Church; and give me leave to put you in mind you cannot affirm it contrary to that Scripture, till you be assured what that Scripture is; and farther, since Scripture cannot be contrary to it self, 'tis lawful for me to beleeve, you may as soon miss the sence of it, as Mr. *White*, whose principal Answer, you in the next place, call a *naked, groundless, not proved Assertion*, and for *naked*, I think you mean want of either proof or ground, for sure you will not except against the want of Rhetorick, and then 'tis the same with one of the other expressions: To the first of which I reply he has expresst the ground of it, *Viz. Tradition*; and to the second, that being the Defendant, it was not his part to prove. But how chance no word to the Argument? According to the small insight I have in Logick, no argument either requires, or can have a fuller answer, then a plain denial of its premises, which I take to be done here.

The Argument is this, Divers Fathers, you say the Fathers, held non-

non-admiſſion before the day of Judgment, wherefore they muſt alſo hold no prayer to Saints: Now, if I aver the admiſſion of Saints before the day of Judgment is taught by Tradition, I think I ſay alſo, that it was taught by the Fathers, and conſequently deny they taught the contrary and muſt beleeve, till I am better inſtructed in the Laws of Diſputations, when thus much is ſaid to an Argument, more ought not, and perhaps cannot be ſaid. Let me add nevertheleſs in this place, that were the antecedent true of *divers Fathers*, if the Conſequent be recommended by *Tradition*, we muſt either reject the Apoſtle, or refuſe to admit of any Plea, not only of Fathers, but even Angels againſt it.

¶ 4. *But to conſider this principal Aſſertion by it ſelf, what ground for it? Can you prove the Fathers held ſo groſs abſurdity, and ſhew clearly this Tradition came from the Apoſtles, that Saints departed have an infinite participation or omniſcience communicated to them from God, as is neceſſary to make them fit objects to be prayed unto, knowing all prayers of every one, every where that are offered up to them? I much deſire to ſee this proved.*

¶ 4

¶ 4. You next demand the ground of this Assertion, and whether the Omniscience of Saints be descended by Tradition from the Apostles? No Sir, I have told you already it belongs not to Faith, but Divinity, where, if you please to take the pains necessary, you may find it proved true, but not of faith; such things belong to the School, not the Church, who will not refuse Communion to any for refusing to beleeve it. The practice of praying to Saints, *Tradition* has, by immemorial custome, setled her in possession of; how that practice is reconciled to Philosophy, whether by the omniscience of Saints, by divine revelation, or other disposition of providence, is disputed in the Schools: while her aim of bringing her Subjects to the esteem and practice of vertue, by the esteem of those whom the practise of it has made so glorious, is perfectly attained without those subtleties, which have no other influence upon our actions, then as fences or out-works, which it belongs to Divinity both to maintain and enlarge; but so as that an Error in it does not weaken her hold which is built

built upon a much ſtronger foundation: Mean time while you aſk, if the Fathers held ſo groſs abſurdities, if you mean omniſcience of Saints, you ſee I maintain it to be no abſurdity, but a great and certain truth; if you mean non omniſcience, I hope you will hereafter be leſs earneſt in maintaining what your ſelf call a groſs abſurdity. In either caſe give me leave to tell you, that for divers Fathers (for that expreſsion, *the Fathers*, which imports them all, fair dealing will not receive into its place) to hold an opinion in matters of learning, which after ages diſcovered unmaintainable, I take to be a conceit very far from abſurdity.

¶ 5. *Have not the holy Angels the ſame ſight of God as Saints? whether Saints are admitted or no, is not ſo certain as that the Angels are in heaven, may they not as well be prayed unto? you muſt confeſs there's no reaſon againſt the one that holds not againſt the other, and I think your* Michael-Maſſes *ſhew you allow both, and ſo run quite blanck againſt that Word which proves your Tradition here falſe;* 2 Col. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humilitie and worſhipping of Angels, intruding in thoſe*

things which he hath not seen vainly puft up by his fleshly mind.

¶ 5. That Holy Angels may as well be prayed to, as Saints, I freely grant, and to what you object out of *Col.* 2. 18. I answer, it is against those who so relyed upon the mediation of Angels, that they denied the meditation of Christ, as S. *Chrysostom* upon this place testifies; there are some who say we must not be reconciled, and have access to God the Father by Christ, but by Angels: An Heresie which I think, is attributed to *Simon Magus*, and called in his followers the Religion of Angels. But the Text seems to need no other Comment then a faithful scanning of it: for it does not barely admonish the *Colossians* to beware of such as endeavoured to seduce them into the worship of Angels, but so as not to hold the head; that is, such a worship as took away, or denied the head, and was inconsistent with our duties to it. Which words, being immediate to those you cite, had in my opinion been proper for your consideration

Sunt quidam qui dicunt non oportere per Christum adduci, sed per Angelos. S. Chrys. Col. 2.

ration before you had ſetled your judgment upon the place which is imperfect without them.

¶ 6. *I cannot ſee but your Tenet is point blank contrary to the Scripture howſoever you palliate it over, and blind your eyes with new coin'd Diſtinctions.* S. John Apoc. 22.8,9. *went to worſhip the Angel, who, in the* 19th chap. verſ. 10. *had told him he was one of his brethren the Prophets that kept the ſayings of that Book himſelf, ſurely he could not look upon him now as God, yet was forbidden to worſhip him with that Religious Worſhip you offer to Saints. Or did* Cornelius, Acts 10. 25, 26. *look upon* Peter *as God, when he fell down before him? the Devil in* Matth. 4. *did not bid our Saviour fall down and worſhip him as God, he had confeſſed God to be, and in ſaying, all theſe are given me, implyed God greater then himſelf; yet our Saviour allegeth Scripture to prove ſuch an action unlawful, It is written,* Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, *Theſe words are nothing to the purpoſe, according to your doctrine, for the Divel might have replyed, I, You may worſhip God and me too; thus you make void the Law of God by your Traditions.*

¶ 6. Your next Paraph passes from the invocation of Saints, to their veneration, and in the first place reprehends some answers, it seems you have met with, under the name of *new coin'd distinctions*. And how to justifie them, or know whether they are justifiable, except you had expressed them, I cannot tell: but in general, to quarrel at the use of distinctions, seems extremely unjust, it being impossible, without them, to arrive at any certainty by the means of words; for there being few, perhaps not any, which are not used in many sences, what imagination can fancy a possibility of fixing upon any one sense by a sound, which is common to many, till they are distinguished one from another, and the particular signification applied to the general word?

Now let us see how you come to be so strongly perswaded of the opposition of our Tenet to Scripture: You say S. *John* in the *Apocalips* was forbidden to worship the Angel with that religious worship we offer to Saints, but have no warrant from the place, to say so, where there is no word to inform us what kind

of

of worſhip it was which the Saint offered, and the Angel refuſed, and you know how dangerous additions or diminutions are: there appeare no more then barely worſhip offered and refuſed; whereof you are ſo intent upon the latter, that you quite forget the former, which nevertheleſs ſeems important enough to deſerve a reflexion; for if worſhip were offered, and offered by *S. John*, that illuminated and beloved Apoſtle, and this when, as you ſay, he was aware it was an Angel to whom he offered it, I cannot ſee but to deny Angel-worſhip is to ſay that great Apoſtle either knew not what was lawful, or acted what he knew unlawful; two Aſſertions, which to embrace, I think, nothing but the neceſſity of defending an ill cauſe, can ingage a man; For my part I muſt deſire none will take it amiſs, if I regulate my actions by thoſe of the beloved Diſciple, and think allowable whatever he thought ſo.

But to look neerer on the place, the worſhip there mentioned being of neceſſity to be ſuppoſed either due or not due; I know ſeveral things are ſaid to render a reaſon why the Angel might re-

fuſe it, in the firſt Suppoſition; and the Saint be miſtaken to offer it in the ſecond; but either I underſtand nothing, or neither Suppoſition affords ground enough to raiſe a battery againſt us; for if it be put due, whatever the reaſon might be of the Angels refuſal, we ſhall be very unjuſtly quarrelled at, for giving every one what's their due. Paying of of debts, ſure, will not become oppoſite to Scripture, if not due, what wonder if the Angel refuſed it? And whatever might be the reaſon of the Apoſtles miſtake, this is certain, that out of this, that an undue honour was refuſed, it will never follow that a due one may not be given. That which we give muſt be firſt proved undue, and unlawful, before it can be concluded againſt by the refuſal of one which was ſo. For, that ſome worſhip is due, ſure none, but a Quaker, will deny, ſince certainly an Angel is as good a perſon as a Juſtice of Peace, to whom nevertheleſs, I hope, by the grace of God, we may ſay without Idolatry, *if it pleaſe your Worſhip.* And for *Religious Worſhip*, which ſeems to ſtick with you, I doubt there is a miſtake, but know

not

not how to rectifie it, if you bar the use of distinctions, whose service if you had pleased to make use of, so far, as to have look'd into the several notions of the Word, my service would have been needless to you.

Religion then signifies the worship of God, and *Religious* by consequence, appertaining, or relating to the worship of God, and this in several, and unequal respects; as when we say a religious man, house, book, demeanour, &c. we mean those persons, or things have relation, though differently, to the service of God. Now the best and most proper seat of Religiousness, is in a soul, and since no quality can be more, or so much, esteemable, we conceive the soul, which has it so be valuable, or to have worth; the acknowledgment of which, we call *worship*, that is testimony of worth.

Farther this worship, being founded, not on the worth rising from natural, or acquired parts, from eminence of dignity, or any civil consideration, but purely on supernatural, or religious endowments, we call religious worship, and mean by it an acknowledgment of worth,

spring-

ſpringing from this, that the perſons to whom we give it, are highly in the favor of God, meerly as ſuch, without mixture of any other conſideration. This kind of worſhip then, is therefore called *religious*, becauſe it aims at God, being given to perſons highly dear to him, and purely upon the ſcore, that they are ſo, and nothing is more plain from common ſence, then that he who honours a perſon, purely as loving another, does by that act heartily honor that other.

From the action of *Cornelius* what you would infer, I am left to gueſs, all the uſe you make, being to ask whether he took S. *Peter* for God? to which after I have replyed, that I conceive he did not, I know not what more to ſay: but me thinks Catholike Religion has a ſtrange Fate, that no act of Chriſtian modeſtie, and humilitie can paſs without being ſtraind into an oppoſition to it.

The laſt place is *Matth.* 4. whence you would prove the Divel did not deſire to be worſhipped as God, becauſe he confeſſed God: Good Sir, does the Divel act according to his knowledg? and can you be ignorant his miſery conſiſts in obſtinate

obſtinate adheſion to things againſt reaſon, and which he ſees to be ſo? Has he changed his mind, think you, ſince the fatal *Ero ſimilis altiſſimo*? This was ſtrangely argued, but to wreſt the place againſt our Tenet, is, I think, ſtranger; it being to ſay men may not honour (*venerari*) Angels, becauſe God refuſed to adore the Divel. How little conſultation did you uſe with your own thoughts in this Paragraph? but you reply, in behalf of the Devil, our Saviour might have worſhipped him, and his Father both: Which ſeems to me to evince, paſt diſpute, that the worſhip deſired by the Devil was ſuch a one as was due to God: for had he meant onely a teſtimony of that excellence which was in him, do you think him ignorant of it who created it? or backward to expreſs his knowledg of it in neceſſary circumſtances, who is juſtice it ſelf? Evidently therefore the Devil deſired what belonged not to him, and ought not to hinder thoſe happy ſpirits from receiving Veneration to whom it does belong; and yet we are ſo unfortunate as to evacuate the Law of God by true Traditions, while you have

the.

the happineſs to preſerve it by untrue Interpretations.

¶ 7. Page 104. *Mr.* White *has a moſt ingenious evaſion of the ſecond Argument, confeſſing the Objection would have force if they did really doubt; I think it is clear they did.* Origen l. 2. in ep. ad Rom. *ſayes, Whether the Saints that are with God do any thing for us and labour; let this alſo be reckoned amongſt the ſecret and hidden things of God, which may not be committed to writing.* So Auſtin (de cur. mor. c. 29.) *leaves it undetermin'd, whether the dead Martyrs do help us or no, and addeth that theſe things paſs our underſtandings, and in Chap. 13. of the ſame Book affirms, That the ſouls of the departed never know what we do here upon earth, and doth bring for proof thereof,* Iſai. 63. 16. *and that of the* Kings 2. 22. 20. I will gather thee to thy Fathers, *&c. That place which Mr.* White *mentions (I ſuppoſe by what I find in ſome, for Mr.* White *mentions not the Authors he anſwers) is* Nazianzen, Invec. 1. in Julianum. *Hear O thou ſoul of great* Conſtantine. (Jacobi Billi annot. 2. in hanc orat.) *if thou have any ſence, &c. What is this O thou moſt divine Emperour? for I am forced to expoſtulate with him, as if he were here preſent,*

present, and heard me, though indeed he be with God; and in his second Invective he calleth unto Julian being dead and damned in Hell. So that for 200 yeers after Christ, there was no Invocation of Saints, as they affirm who have perused all the Monuments of those times. Origen and others after him speaks so as it appears, they could not teach it for a truth, seeing they profess themselves ignorant of the Saints conditions, others flatly deny they know what we do, yet I perceive there was a custome taken up among some to commemorate the deceased Martyrs, yet without that impiety which afterward crept in. Austin, de vera Relig. cap. 55. says, Let not our Religion be to worship the dead; we are to honour them for imitation sake, but not to worship them for religion sake. This exhortation of his implies, a superstitious custome then taken up, by some against which he speaks. Et de civitate Dei l. 22. c. 10. He says we do not build Temples unto our Martyrs as unto Gods, but we set up Memorials for them, as for men departed whose souls do live in rest with God, nor do we set up any Altars to sacrifice unto them, but we offer up our Sacrifice unto one onely God, both theirs and ours; at which sacrifice they are named in their order, as men of God, who have conque-

red

red the world by confeſſing him, but they are not invocated of the Prieſt that ſacrificeth: But afterward as Mr. White *cannot deny,* p. 105. *It was crowded into the Liturgie by* Petrus Gnaphæus *an Heretick: Thus the private devotion of ſuperſtitious men became firſt publike, which ſome of the* Fathers *plainly ſpeak againſt, as* Ambroſ. in expoſ. epiſt. ad Rom. Solent quidem miſera uti excuſatione, dicentes per juſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicut per comites (*therefore he accuſeth them, not for worſhipping Saints as God, as ſupream being; but juſt as you pretend yet to do*) pervenitur ad Regem. Euge: nunquid tam demens eſt aliquis, & ſalutis ſuæ immemor, ut honorificentiam Regis vindicet comiti, cum hac de re, ſi qua etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut res damnentur majeſtatis? & iſti non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deſerunt creaturæ, & relicto domino adorant conſervos, quaſi ſit aliquid plus quod ſervetur Deo. Nam & ideo ad Regem per tribunos & comites itur, quia homo, utique Rex, & neſcit quibus debeat remp. credere. Ad Deum autem, quem utique non latet (omnium enim merita novit) promerendum, ſuffragatore non eſt opus,

ſed

ſed mente devota. Ubicunq; enim talis locutus fuerit nihil reſpondebit.

¶ 7. This Paragraph is made up of Quotations, but ſo odly uſed, to ſay no worſe, that I cannot but conclude you took them upon truſt, and take the liberty to repreſent again to you the extream injuſtice you do your own ſoul, to take it upon pretence of the fallibility of men, and inſecurity of blind obedience, and implicite faith, out of the conduct of the Catholick Church, in whoſe faithful boſome innumerable millions are ſecure, to ſubject it to a truly blind and implicite obedience of ſome one or few cryed up, not by deſert but faction, and if living, perhaps little known beyond the bounds of a Pariſh, I dare ſay not reverend enough to ſway an entire one, and who not only may, but do deceive you. I ſhould beg of you this Point might find admittance to your moſt ſerious and quiet thoughts, but that eternal happineſs or miſery is a concern of that importance, that where it pleads, prays, and whatever elſe the deſire of ſerving a worthy perſon can ſuggeſt, may, and perhaps ought to be ſilent.

But, to begin with Mr. *White*, I doubt you ſtretch his grant beyond his intentions; for I cannot beleeve he meant the *ſame force* which he allows the Argument, great enough either to overthrow, as you ſeem to ſuppoſe, or ſo much as ſtand in competition with *Tradition*, ſo as that we ſhould be uncertain which to follow, the doubt of the one, or certainty of the other; but only that the caſe, when proved, would alſo prove ſome Father held an Opinion in matter of learning, not faith, which in its conſequence was oppoſite to *Tradition*, but becauſe this was not yet penetrated into the opinion onely, not the maintainer, blameable.

To come now to your Citations: The firſt is from *Origen*, *lib.* 2. *in Ep. ad Rom.* where one half of the period is quite cut off, and the ſence of the remaining half, fixt upon one part of the words, the reſt being ſuppreſſed: Juſt as if, out of this Period, *I will go to* London *on horſback*, one ſhould leave the laſt words, and prove, out of the former, I meant to go on foot. The ſentence in *Origen* lies thus: *Jam vero ſi extra corpus poſiti*

positi vel sancti, qui cum Christo sunt, agunt aliquid & laborent pro nobis, ad similitudinem Angelorum qui salutis nostræ ministeria procurant; vel rursum peccatores etiam ipsi extra corpus positi agunt aliquid secundum propositum mentis suæ, Angelorum nihilominus ad similitudinem sinistrorum, cum quibus in æternum ignem mittendi dicuntur à Christo; habeatur hoc quoque inter occulta Dei neque chartulæ committenda mysteria. Compare now the citation with the place cited, and judge of the sincerity of the Quoter. The words have long since been examined by *Bellarmine*, who lodges *Origens* doubt, not upon assistance or not assistance, but upon this whether the assistance be *ad similitudinem Angelorum*, or no, that is, by way of office and special deputation.

There follows *S. Aust de cur. mort.* who is so far from leaving it undetermin'd, whether the dead Martyrs help us or no, (as you put it) That I will yeeld my claim to him, if your studie can furnish you with plainer and more expres words to signifie in the very place you urge the Question was, not *whether*, but *how*, those Martyrs do help those, *quos per eos certum est adjuvari*, says he, whether by them-

ſelves, by the Miniſtery of Angels, or other diſpoſition of the Divine providence. Nay, his ſence in that point is ſo very cleer, that I am at a loſs how to contrive a way, being very unwilling to impute it to wilfulneſs, by which he ſhould be miſtaken. For the Queſtion diſputed in that Book, being, whether it avail a dead man, that his body be inter'd neer the ſhrine of a Martyr; S. *Auſtin* maintains the Affirmative upon this ground, That ſuch a Poſition cauſes the man to be more often and more lively recommended to the aſſiſtance of that Martyr by the prayers of the living; and how he, who juſtifies the choice of place in burial, by the advantage received in being recommended to the aſſiſtance of a Martyr, ſhould be imagined to doubt whether there be any aſſiſtance or no, and think it unlawful to demand it, the ſhortneſs of my ſight cannot diſcover.

He is indeed (in his 13*th chap.*) of opinion, that Souls departed are not, by the condition of their ſtate, any longer acquainted with the paſſages of this life; but tells us preſently, that defect is ſupplied, either by intelligence from ſuch

as

as newly die, or from Angels, or it may be from God himself; however it be, he most evidently and undeniably asserts the custome in his time of praying for the dead, and praying for them to Saints. To make an end of this authority, there being in this matter, as in all others, to be distinguished what is Faith, from what is Learning; the first being no more then barely, that 'tis good and profitable to have recourse to the assistance of Saints: To the last belonging many Questions, in some ages more doubtful, in some, as truth opens to time and industry, more setled, but still remaining points of learning, not faith; I onely desire of you that you will please to be of that Faith in this Point which S. *Austin* plainly and unquestionably delivers in this very Book, which being insisted on by your self, I do not see you can offer less, and promise I will expect no more: Marry, because in a point of School-learning he maintains an opinion now generally disallowed; to infer, he was against the practise of the Church, because his Position, in which he was wrong, may be conceived opposite to it, when he both

plainly atteſts, and approves the practice, and uſes much diligence and ſtudie to reconcile his Poſition to it, is a proceeding I had rather you ſhould correct, then I cenſure.

There follow two paſſages out of two Invectives of S. *Greg. Naz.* which I ſee are examples of *Proſopopœia*, and no more in them; but doubt whether the following Aſſertion be ſtranger, or the Connexion of it, with a *ſo that*, as if becauſe S. *Gregory* above 300 years after Chriſt, made uſe of a Rhetorical figure, therefore in the firſt 200 yeers, there was no Invocation of Saints. To the thing it ſelf, I ſhall ſay no more; then humbly deſire you to beware of blind obedience and implicite faith, of condemning and practiſing the ſame thing, and if you will believe fallible men, to beleeve the Fathers themſelves, and not what more fallible men tell you of them. I would gladly know alſo what thoſe, you give ſo much credit to, do bring to juſtifie themſelves, and their ſaying, that in that time there was no Invocation. I do not beleeve they produce any plain place which deny ſuch practiſes were, or were lawful to be uſed;

and

and conceive, they either argue from the silence of some of them, that there was no such thing, because they say nothing of it, which (besides that it wildly supposes whatsoever was writ in these Ages, came safely down to us) is as much as to expect, that whatever subject a man chuses for his Book, he must treat of all things in it; or else make use of, perhaps their Errors, in School points, as the ignorance of souls departed, the impossibility of commerce betwixt the next world and this, &c. to overthrow what they might, as S. *Austin* long after clearly did, held true, even while they held these errors, and this, (to say nothing of the injustice it does the Fathers, to extend a mistake of theirs in a point of learning, without sufficient ground, to their faith too,) is instead of discovering error, by its opposition to truth, to take the error for truth, and then conclude the truth to be the error: This kind of proceeding has strange luck, to gain credit with so nice and piercing a judgement as yours.

What S. *Austin* says, in the two following Citations, is the very thing the Church

Church beleevs, and practiſes at this day, and what whoever profeſſes, ſhe is ready to imbrace in her ſacred Communion; it being the cuſtom, even at this day, that Saints are not invocated at the Holy Sacrifice, all the prayers there being purely addreſſed to God.

And for *Petrus Gnapheus*, ſince you produce no reaſon why I ſhould not, I cannot ſee but Mr. *Whites* Obſervation is ſatisfactory beyond Reply; *Viz.* That ſince his authority, how great ſoever it were, could not preſerve him from being condemned of Hereſie; this fact could not have failed to peep among the reſt of his Hereſies, had the Church not found it conſonant to her faith.

The laſt is from S: *Ambroſe*, then which I never ſaw any thing more wretchedly mangled. The place is an explication of *v.* 22. *cap.* 1. *ad Rom. ſaying themſelves to be wiſe, they became fools*; This he attributes to the vain power upon the courſe of the Heavens and ſtars, who, by challenging an opinion of wiſdom from the knowledg of ſuch glorious creatures, were loſt in the folly of ſtaying there, and not paſſing on to the Creator. *Se-*

lent

lent tamen, says the Book, *pudore passi negletti Dei, miserandi excusatione dicentes per istos*, &c. where first the word *tamen* is changed into *quidam*, which makes the sense absolute, whereas the first evidently restrains it to what went before, *viz.* Those vain Philosophers: Then *pudore passi negletti Dei*, which are also relative, are quite left out, and to compleat the work, the word *istos*, is turned into *justos*, which can no more fit the place then Giant, or Castle; for he being to explicate the Apostles meaning, and the Apostle plainly speaking of the vanity of humane Philosophy, would he not have hit his sence finely to make him talk of Saints worship? Can those mens excuse be imagined so miserable, as to alledge, in justification of their not glorifying God, that Saints are to God, as Courtiers to Princes, that never thought of Saints, nor if they had, were one jot neerer their excuse: This is a kind of dealing which our obedience, as blind as you conceive it, would not endure: But I forbear to press it farther, then in behalf of your own happiness, to beseech your own calm thoughts may work freely and impartially upon it.

SECT.

Sect. IV.

Images.

PAge 176. *Mr* White *answers the Objection of the second Commandment, that if it binds now, then the whole Ceremonial Law does, but I cannot see that prohibition is a Ceremony? It is not repeated in the new Testament, therefore it does not bind, I see no force in that Argument neither, many precepts of the old are not repeated in the new, which notwithstanding bind us now: as, not to lie with beasts, not to remove antient landmarks,* &c. *Where is the tenth Commandment repeated in so many words? But is there nothing of the second in the New Testament? I shall remember you of one, and that is in the* 17th *of the* Acts, *where* S. Paul *is preaching the Gospel to the* Athenians: *confutes their* (and your) *superstition of worshipping the unknown* (which was *the true*) *God, by bodily representations in the* 29th *verse; we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver graven by art and mens device, God is not like unto any similitude the art of man can devise, therefore ought not to be worshipped by similitudes,*

therefore

therefore no pictures or representations of him are to be made, whether it be of man, or birds, or four-footed beasts, or of creeping things (as the words are, Rom. 1. 25.*) whereby some, instead of glorifying God, have dishonoured him, and changed his glory, as if there were not a greater evil (because of the greater disproportion between the infinite Majesty of Heaven and Earth, and any finite thing) to worship or represent God in a shape infinitely below him, then there would be for a subject to go and fall down to a Toad under him, for to worship and honour his King in it. That reason of the Apostle in* Acts 17. *is the very same with that* Isai. 40. 18. *where God speaks against his being worshipped under shapes; First, in many expressions describes his own greatness and Majestie; the Nations of the Earth all are but as the drop of a Bucket to him, &c. concludes from all, To whom then will you liken God, or what likeness will you compare to him? The workman melteth, &c. What* Mr. White *says, p.* 110. *of the marks of the Church, as apparent enough out of Scripture, I say of this point, If there want not will in the seeker to acknowledge them.* Lactantius *saith,* Just. l. 2. c. 19. *where Images are for Religions sake, there is no Religion. The*

Council

Council of Elibera, Can. 36. *decreed, that nothing ſhould be painted on the walls of Churches, which is adored of the people.* Origen cont. Celſ. l. 7. *We ſuffer not any to worſhip Jeſus at Altars, Images and Temples; becauſe it is written,* Thou ſhalt have none other Gods, &c. Epiphanius epiſt. ad Joh. Hieruſ. *ſaith, It is againſt the Authority of the Scriptures, to ſee the* Images *of Chriſt, or of any Saints, hanging in the Church. In the ſeventh Council of* Conſtantinople, *thoſe words of* Epiphanius *are cited againſt the* Encraticæ; *be mindful beloved children not to bring Images into the Church, nor ſet them in the places where the Saints are buried, but always carry God in your hearts; neither let them be ſuffered in any common houſe, for it is not meet that a Chriſtian ſhould be occupied by the eyes, but by the meditation of the mind.*

¶ 1. You reply to Mr. *White's* anſwer to the uſual Objection from the Decalogue, that you cannot ſee that prohibition is a Ceremony; but what's this to the purpoſe? There is no diſtinction in Mr. *White* of Ceremonial, or not Ceremonial, but a plain Conſequence authorized by the Apoſtle, that who receives,

as

as of obligation, any part of the Law in vertue of the Law, be it Ceremony, or what elſe it can be, is bound, in purſuance of that action, to receive the whole Law. If you derive your Tenet from the Law of Nature, as your mentioning Ceremonies ſeems to ſuppoſe, what do you cite the Decalogue for? prove the Prohibition contrary to the Law of Nature, and you have done your buſineſs; But ceaſe to object the Jews Law, in vertue of which you either receive it not, and then cannot preſs it, or elſe are obliged to receive the whole Law with it. This Conſequence too, that if it be not repeated in the new Law, it binds not, you do not ſee: I cannot tell what dimneſs has of a ſudden overcaſt as clear a ſight as I have met with; but me thinks nothing can be plainer, then that if the whole Law be aboliſhed, no part of it can be binding, but in vertue of ſome other Law in which it is inſerted.

For the examples you alledge, of Precepts unrepeated, and yet binding, The firſt is cleerly againſt the Law of nature, and in vertue of that, not the old precept, to be avoided. The ſecond, how do you

prove obliging, farther then the municipal Laws we live under exact it? But what makes you demand a repetition of the tenth Commandment *in so many words?* Cannot the same thing be commanded in several words? or would you determine the command to the words, not what is meant by them? But you have found this command repeated in the New Testament in these words of S. *Paul We ought not to think the Godhead is like to gold or silver, graven by art and mens device;* and if you can make these two Propositiòn, *God is not like an Image*, and *Thou shalt not make an Image to adore it*, to be the same, I shall think that though Images are not, your power in reasoning is, in something, very like the Godhead; for 'twill be omnipotent.

Then you discourse in this manner: *God is not like unto any similitude the art of man can devise, therefore ought not to be worshipt by similitudes.* If nothing can be like him and consequently nothing be a similitude, sure you need not fear that worship which can never be, since it supposes a thing which can never be. But I suppose you mean, by *similitudes*, Images, whether

whether like or unlike; and then pray how does it follow, no Image can be like him, therefore no honor can redound to him, that is, no benefit to us, by Images. To worship these Images, so as to beleeve them either him, or like him, which are the things I conceive, the Apostle speaks against, we do abhor with the height of detestation; but if they induce us to worship him oftner, and more ardently then we should without them, how can it be but that to oppose them is to oppose his worship? *Therefore no Pictures or Representations of him are to be made.* Beseech you Sir, what Law is there against making Pictures which are not like? Sure you would be very severe to ill Painters. But the truth is, the Pictures which are made of God are indeed no more then signs, which present him to our memory, and called pictures of him with no more justice, then a Bush would be called the Picture of Wine. For the nature of a Picture consisting in representing to the eye, the same proportion, colour, and figure of parts, upon a piece of cloth, or wood, which we see in the Original, I refer

my ſelf to your own candor to judge whether we be guilty of the impiety of believing, parts, or colour, or any thing which the art of painting is able to reach, to be in God; for painting is only of bodies, and thoſe groſſe ones too; to expreſſe wind, or thoſe ſmaller parts which affect the Smell, Taſt, *&c.* is beyond her Sphere. So that none, who is in his ſences, can imagin us ſo damnably ſenceleſſe, as to believe 'tis in its power to frame any repreſentation of God, which, with any propriety can be called a Picture of him. Theſe, which we have, by cuſtom, warranted, and perhaps begun, by authority of Scripture, bring, by the ſhapes they repreſent, the Divinity into our memories, and adoration of it, not of the pictures, into our hearts: and, except it be unlawful to remember and adore the Deity, I cannot imagine it ſhould be unlawful to uſe means which conduce to that end.

By this, I preſume, you already ſee the diſparity of the Compariſon of pictures to a Toad; but firſt, what mean you by *worſhipping God in a ſhape?* if you mean, that we hold, either that ſhape to be his, or he to be in it, more then his ubiquity makes him

him present to all things, you either mistake, or wrong us: and what else that expression should signifie, I see not. Next, what is there of common betwixt these Pictures, and the Toad, whether you look upon the end, or means? The end of our Pictures is the Adoration of God, a duty, which, since you cannot deny to be often necessary, and never unfit, you should deny us no occasion that prompts us to perform it. And for the means: We conceave, that, as no notion can be attributed to God, but with much impropriety, so we cannot chuse a better than what the Scripture attributes to him in the vision of the Prophet *Daniel*, viz. *antiquus Dierum*. We use therefore, to put us in mind of God, a Picture, which presents to our eyes the reverence of Age, which, if you have any quarrel to, blame the Scripture in which we find it, and which, by an universal custom, was, without memory of its beginning, and therefore, if *St. Austins* rule hold, like to descend from the Apostles, presently conveys to our Soul, an apprehension first, and then an adoration of God. For the Toad, what has it, either from nature, or custom, to do with the

King, that he that falls down to it, should be thought to honour him? and what can hinder it from being judged, even by the King himself, pretended to be honoured by it, a most ridiculous and unworthy action?

What you say next, of the conformity of the reasons brought in the *Acts*, to those in *Isay*, I shall not examine; since the conclusion, you make, being no more, then that nothing like to God can be made, I hold it as great impiety to deny it, as I conceive there is impossibility of deducing from that truth any thing to the prejudice of this other, which I am maintaining.

The rest are Quotations, so carelesly gathered, to say no more, that I know not whether I should more blame your Credulity (for I am sure they owe not their birth to the Candor you profesſe) in giving your self up to the conduct of others, who are so able to guide your self, or pitty your misfortune that those you honour with so much confidence, should so little deserve it. The words of *Lactantius* are these, *Quare nullus est dubium quin Religio nulla sit, ubicunque Simulacrum est.* where

by

by *Simulacrum*, is plainly meant an Idol, as by the whole intent of the book, which is *contra Gentiles*, by his subsequent proof, and by these words almost immediately preceding, *Non sub pedibus quærat Deum, nec a vestigiis suis erret quod adoret*, evidence past dispute. And had you seen the place, you could not have doubted but his *Simulacrum* is a figure believed to be God, and so adored, which, till we maintain lawful, *Lactantius* is very unjustly brought to oppose us.

The 36 *Can.* of the Council of *Eliberis* runs thus: *Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur*; A decree which may as well be made now, as then, did Circumstances require it from the wisdom of our Governours. For we say not, that 'tis unlawful not to have Pictures in Churches, but, that 'tis not unlawful to have them. Now because the prudence of those Fathers judged them inconvenient in those times of persecution, and that place (for this Council of no more then 19 Bishops concerns only *Spain*,) Can any Candour infer they judged them absolutely unlawful, and unpermittable to any

Place,

Place, Time, or Circumſtance? Beſides, as far as probability may be allow'd to interpret this Prohibition, it proceeded from the reverence had of Sacred Images, which it therefore forbad, leſt they ſhould run the hazard of being diſgracefully or unhandſomly defaced in thoſe unſetled times, either by the moyſture of the wall, on which they were painted, or the malice of their Perſecutors, impoſſible to be avoyded while they were fix'd to the Fabrick. For what elſe can *Ne in parietibus quod colitur, depingatur*, ſignifie? for ſo it is, and not as you cite it, That nothing be painted which is adored. Which, if true, as 'tis much the likelyeſt to be ſo of any thing hitherto ſuggeſted to my thoughts, It will be very fine, that their care to preſerve Images, ſhould be turn'd into an Argument to overthrow them.

I cannot find any ſuch words as you mention in *Origen*. nor do believe any elſe will, having read the place you cite with ſome diligence.

That piece of the Epiſtle of *Epiphanius* is looked upon as a foul, and manifeſt forgery, The reaſons you may ſee in *Bellarmin de Imag. lib 2. c. 9.* And for the laſt paſſage, attributed

attributed, by you to the *7th.* Council of *Constantinople*, it happened in the *7th* general Council, *viz.* the *2d.* of *Nice*; and the words are imposed upon *Epiphanius* by *Gregorius*, who disputed for the Hereticks, but plainly deny'd to be his by *Epiphanius Diaconus*, who argued for the Catholicks. Pray take care what credit you give to persons, who cloath a manifest forgery, openly detected in a general Council, with the authority of such a man, as *Epiphanius*; and so openly detected, that 'tis impossible your Author, who ever he be, should be ignorant of it.

SECT. V.

The Conclusion.

¶ 1. *From all I have said I cannot but conclude; 1st. that Scripture is a sufficient Rule to Salvation. If you ask me how I know Scripture, to be the word of God? I answer, I have no cause to doubt it, no more than whether* Tullyes [illegible] Aristotles *works be theirs; yea lesse, I see it evident by universal*

universal tradition, in respect of place and time, All Monuments of Antiquity sufficiently prove it, by comparing passages and circumstances of all times, since those books were first written. If the only Argument to move me to this Assent, were only your present Churches assertion, I confesse, what you use to urge, I must receive all she says. But then I think, I must as well receive the Alcoran *to be the word of God, because the Mahumetan Church sayes so.*

¶ 1. FRom what has been said, I cannot but conclude that Scripture is so far from being a sufficient Rule to Salvation, (meaning, by *Rule*, such a one as we have all this while been talking of) that to rely upon it, with no better an Interpreter of the Letter, then the Letter it self, is the way to destroy all means first, and then all hopes of Salvation: That principle being the true gate, through which all the Sects, which, with their numerous swarms, overburden and afflict Christianity, have entred. For what the Protestant Prelacy alleages to justifie their Schism from their Catholick Superiors, the very same is a plea for Presbytery against Prelacy, for Anabaptism

Anabaptiſm againſt Presbytery, for Independency againſt all; and how far the Chain may be ſtretched, which already reaches to the 5*th*. Monarchy, and Quakeriſm, none knows; But this I am ſure of, that every linck is as ſtrong as the firſt.

For the reaſon you give, why you beleeve Scripture to be Scripture, *viz.* becauſe you have no reaſon to doubt it; 'tis an invincible demonſtration of the force of prejudice, and more of reaſon I ſee nothing in it. Had your mind been in the ſame temper it was in the firſt *Sect.* of this part, would have been reaſon ſufficient, not only to doubt, but to reject it, that you had not evidence of its certainty. For there a man muſt plainly deny aſſent to what even *all Doctors* determine, though he have no-ſo much-as-probable Objection againſt them, upon this onely ground, That he has not evidence their determination is certain, and here he muſt yeeld aſſent, becauſe he has not evidence the thing he aſſents to, is not certain. Which is want of evidence muſt at one time produce diſſent, at another aſſent, as it ſuits with your inclinations to the caſe it is applied

ply,d to. Besides, if all parts of Scripture have been doubted of, and denyed too, nay some, which you receive, by several even of the Fathers, Why should not you think you have reason to doubt, as well as those who lived neerer the Primitive times, and should know more? who shall satisfie a Critical Soul, that all their doubts were ever fairly answered, and they not more oppress'd by strength, then satisfi'd by reason? and this also destroys your pretence to universal Tradition of time and place; since that could not, in your grounds, be delivered with universality, which by some has been denyed.

vid. Hierom. de Scrip. Eccl. in Petro, Jacobo, Juda, Paulo. Spondan. ad an. 60. & 98. Com. Laod. &c.

And for your Monuments of Antiquity, I beseech you pretend not to prove it that way, for I think I deal liberally, if I allow you to have examined ten Authors of every age, and what proof are ten of the sentiments of 1000000? Then what do you find in these Authors? certain places of Scripture cited out of such books, as we still have; but whether those books contained then the same number of Chapters

ters and Verſes they do now, you will find very few to ſpeak to. Nay I do not believe you will find ten in all Ages that give you a Catalogue of the Books themſelves, much leſs of the Chapters and Verſes: So that your conſpiracy of all Monuments of Antiquity will not amount to ten men in fifteen Ages. I muſt deſire you not to miſtake what I have ſaid, as if I alſo doubted of Scripture, which I acknowledg to be the Word of God, reverence it as ſuch, and know the denyers of it were, for the moſt part, Hereticks. All I aim at, is by an Argument *ad hominem*, to ſhew the power of prejudice, to which what is reaſon, when of one ſide, ceaſes to be reaſon when on the contrary. If, therefore, you faithfully purſue your own Principles, what ever you think, the true ground why you receive Scripture is the preſent Churches Authority, and you mould, as you rightly infer, receive the ſenſe, as well as words from her. And for your fear of the *Alcoran*, you will need no other ſecurity then your own thoughts, if you reflect that all, which the teſtimony of the Mahumetan Church (if that

name be tolerable) conc'udes, is, That what ſhe ſays was delivered by *Mahomet*, was truly delivered by *Mahomet*; and to ſo much I think you will allow her teſtimony good, beleeving you do not doubt but that *Mahomet* was truly Author of the *Alcoran*; and ſo much if you allow her, you cannot deny the Teſtimony of a Chriſtian Church; *Viz.* That what ſhe affirms was delivered by Chriſt, was truly delivered by Chriſt, and farther Tradition reaches not. Now the Minor, neceſſary to a concluſion of Religion, that what was delivered by *Mahomet*, was inſpired by God, I am ſure you hold as great impiety to grant, as Blaſphemy to deny that which we ſubſume; *viz.* that what was delivered by Chriſt did truly proceed from God. Tradition then of the *Alcoran*, and Tradition of Chriſtian doctrine, agree in this, that they prove, the one to have deſcended from *Mahomet*, the other from Chriſt, but Chriſtianity endures not either that a delivery from *Mahomet* ſhould, or that a delivery from Chriſt ſhould not argue a neceſſity of obedience, to what was ſo delivered, as to ſacred and heavenly truth.

¶ 2.

¶ 2. *Secondly, I say, if you can prove or produce any Tradition for any revealed truth not contained in the Bible, as clearly universal for time and place, as that Tradition which assures me, the Bible is the Word of God, I must imbrace it.*

¶ 2. Secondly I conceive there is no point of our faith, but has, not onely as clearly an universal *Tradition*, but a much clearer both for time and place then the *Scripture*, a truth which since you may find in the first Sections of *Rushworths second Dialogue*: I shall only wonder here, you see not that the very Arguments which you make against the universality of Tradition for some points, as that they have been doubted of, and rejected by some, are every whit as forcible against Scripture, whereof there is no part which has not been both doubted of, and rejected too; by Hereticks indeed (at least for the most part, for some also of the Fathers have doubted even of some Books, which your selves receive) but so also were they who rejected the points in question, whose opposition, if it be not allowed against Scripture, cannot be valid to any thing, but prejudice

against points of doctrine: Be true therefore, if you please, to your own reason, and embrace that principle, and the Communion of those who own it, which alone can, with certainty, convey to you these sacred Truths which are necessary for your happiness.

¶ 3. *Thirdly, I cannot grant your Church was the onely one before* Luthers *time, there's the Greek, Abyssen, and others there may be in several parts of the world that I know not of.*

¶ 3. Thirdly, What you mean here by our Church, I cannot tell; if onely that number of Orthodox Christians, who live within the Precincts of the Roman, either Diocess or Patriarchate, I know no body maintains, I'm sure I do not beleeve, the number of the faithful is confin'd to that Pale. But to answer of every particular place where Christians live, till it be agreed what they held; and of what may be too, as well as what is, seems unreasonable either me to undertake, or you to exact; thus much is true in general, that whatever company of men, where-ever they live, hold this only principle of unity both

both in faith and government, so as to be a Church, are, not another, but our Church; and who hold it not, are no Church at all.

¶ 4. *Fourthly, I see no necessity, that any one particular Church should continue uncorrupted, or that it is necessary, the greatest number of Professors of Christianity should have uncorrupted Religion. In the days of* Elijah *the Prophet, there were but* 700 *that had not bowed the knee to* Baal, *which the Prophet, that thought himself alone, knew not of.*

¶ 4. That there is any necessity a particular Church should always remain uncorrupted, or that the greatest number of professors of Christianity should have uncorrupted Religion, are two Propositions, which, since any body does, I am sure no body is bound to maintain, I am glad they impose upon me no necessity of contest with you in this Paragraph. But least you should think, it would follow thence that *Tradition* were uncertain; I must affirm that, not only a particular Church, but scarcely a particular family, that is, well instructed, can possibly err, if they stick to *Tradition*, and that the

universality of the Church, though ten thousand times more dispersed then it is, cannot secure it from error, if they desert it.

¶ 5. *Lastly, I see no proof of your infallibility, sure I am, it is a safer way to preserve truths in writing then to be transmitted by the various apprehensions and mmories of multitudes, and truly I beleeve you would not have retained so much truth as you have, had it not been for the Bible, and other writings, and so I see not how you prove any thing has been intirely transmitted onely by Tradition. Much lesse how it is proved, there could creep no error into your Faith.*

¶ 5. Lastly, I would fain flatter my self, with hopes of success, in the design I have had to serve you; but however that proves, must needs take the liberty to think, if you do not yet see the proof you mention, the fault is not in the object. Only I presume there is no mistake in the word *Infallibility*, which placed singly, may speak an Attribute too much approaching to Divinity to belong to any thing of mortal, but by extraordinary priviledge, since it extends it self to all subjects whatsoever: whereas with us

as 'tis confined to matters of Faith, and signifies but this, that we can neither be deceived in what we hear, nor deceive our posterity in what we relate concerning these matters. Now it being the nature of man to speak truth, and the number of men being, in this case beyond all temptations, whether of hopes, fears, or whatever else may be imagined should prevail with them to contradict their nature, I cannot see but a little reflexion must needs make you acknowledge 'tis beyond the power of imagination it self to put any deceit in their testimony, since it will be to put an effect, whose cause, the putter sees, neither is, nor, can be.

That Truths may be preserv'd in writing I doubt not; nay, even better, then by the various apprehensions, and memories of multitudes: But if there be no variety in their apprehensions, nor dependance on their memories, continual practice, overweighing the defects of nature, I cannot see but 'tis much easier to beat a man from a sence whereof he has no other hold then a word, appliable to another sence, then to beat a multitude from the judgements which they are in possession of, and confirmed

confirm'd by the daily actions of their whole lives. Beſides, while the writings preſerve the truth, who ſhall preſerve the writings from falſe copying, and all the errors which both negligence and knavery threaten them withall? and if the Veſſel be tainted, what ſhall keep the Wine pure?

For the reſt, I conceive, that whatever you think of us, your ſelves would not have the truths you have, had not nature maintained that *Tradition* in your practice, you deny in your words; Your faith of the Bleſſed Trinity is right, becauſe no intereſt has yet moved you to follow your principles againſt it: But give an *Arian* the ſame liberty againſt it, you take againſt us, and if you convince him, you will as much deceive me, as I think you do your ſelves to beleeve you can do it. The ſame I ſay of Baptiſm, of Prelacy, and the reſt of thoſe truths you profeſs, all which, while you pretend *Scripture*, it is *Tradition* which has truly conveyed to you, and you have kept ſince becauſe no body has oppoſed them, but when they do, have no more hold then of thoſe you have deſerted. Neither

is

is it possible for your principles to convince an Adversary that makes advantage of them, neither just to condemn him, for it will be to condemn your selves and that plea, which, if it justifie you, must absolve him.

That faith has been so transmitted by *Tradition*, that it has not been written, is not Mr. *Whites* tenet; but that writing, at least the writings we have, is not able so to transmit it, as is necessary for the Salvation of mankind, without *Tradition*. This being the security of whatever writting faith is contained in; if it be Scripture, we know the sense by Tradition: if a Father, he is of authority, in as much as what he writes is consonant to Tradition; if any thing be found to disagree, that not having any weight.

¶ 6. *First, I ask whether an Error cannot overspread the face of the greatest Church visible? It hath done so in the* Arians *time, In our Saviours time.*

Secondly, whether an Error once spread cannot continue? Arianism continued most universal for many years: Mahomets Errors and Blasphemies for many Ages; Jewish Suppositious Traditions, longer yet

then

then they. What ſecurity then can a man have, that Errors could not creep into the the Church? while it is your Principle to embrace any thing your Councils ſhall determine.

¶ 6. To your firſt Queſtion I anſwer, if that may be called a Church, which wants the only principle which can make a Church, I conceive an error may very eaſily overſpread the face of the greateſt viſible; There being no more to do then to deſert this Rule, and then truth will, not only eaſily, but almoſt certainly deſert her; without adhering to *Tradition*, I know no ſecurity, any number of men, be it never ſo great, can have of truths above the reach of natural reaſon, ſuch as are the Maxims of Religion; But let the Church, you ſpeak of, adhere to *Tradition*, and be largely diffuſed, and I conceive it as impoſſible that Error ſhould overſpread it, as that it ſhould be ignorant of what it does every day.

To the ſecond, ſince the ſuppoſal of an Error being ſpread, ſuppoſes a deſtruction of that fence, which only could keep it out, *viz.* cleaving to *Tradition*, I conceive an Error once ſpread not only may, but will

will continue without extraordinary Providence of Almighty God. Arianism, which you exemplifie in, was plainly brought in by preferring the interpretations, which *Arius* made of Scripture, (as you do those of *Luther*, &c.) before the Doctrine delivered by their Forefathers, neither was there any cure for the disease, till they purged themselves of novelty, and rested in the ancient Doctrine. *Mahomet* also took the same course, and all those, whom his impieties will bring to Hell, will owe their damnation to the deserting of this principle, which had his followers not first been cozened from, it had not been possible for him to have undon so great a part of the world. *Jewish Traditions* I have already spoken of, and hope I need not again put you in mind, they have nothing common with *Tradition* but the name. This principle then, and only this of adhering to *Tradition*, gives a man all imaginable security that Errors neither have, nor could creep into our Church.

As for blindly embracing what ever is determined by Councils, I doubt you are not Master of our Doctrine in that point. For the Rule, even of Councils themselves,

is

is *Tradition*, and were it possible They should contradict it, we are taught to adhere to *Tradition* against both them, and Angels too. Whether the case can ever happen I know not, and conceive nothing, but the roving of a wild fancy, will make it possible: but if it do, I have told you our Doctrine.

¶ 7. *What though you have Tenets of a* 1000 *years standing, they are never the truer, seeing Errors have been so long, and longer ago, and some are known to have been propagated as far from Father to Son, it is all one as if they yesterday begun, seeing the succeeding age has nothing of Divine truth, which was not in the precedent. Now how can you assure us, every one of yours were clearly throughout every one age. The Reason* pa. e 8. *which Mr. White makes his Demonstration, to me is a meer Sophism the* 8th. *age (suppose) could not entertain any new Opinion or Error, because its principle was, by which it was to judge of truth; Nothing is to be admitted as of Faith, except what was delivered to it by the former, the Reason of the Consequence is, because then they would contradict themselves. What then? Is it impossible for a man to take up a*

new

new Opinion, and think it true (though he be mistaken) because of some principle he holds, which proves it false, if discern'd; How is that argument cleer convincing of it self, without the help of other considerations (reason, common sence, and experience, tell me the contrary?) If it be sufficient, why does not Mr. White keep to it alone (I find him scarce ever after making use of it) without any other to salve all Objections by? as he might if it were universally true and evident. All he says is to evade the Arguments, and only keep to this; That no age did adm t any new point de facto, which way I confesse sufficient for you to keep your hold, if satisfactorily done; but then you must not pretend to infallibility, for you only prove (seemingly) possession, but I see nothing proves the impossibility of the contrary, suppose one grant you the possession: I see the largeness of your Territories, is that wherein your chief strength does lie. Mr. White often denyes the possibility of any corruption, because it would have bred such a combustion as would have been known; this is the only appearance of Reason or Proof, that to my best Apprehension, I find in both him, and Mr. Rushworth. But without quotation of innumerable Authors which he promises to perform only by Reason) he can

never give any positive sufficient Proof, that there was never in any age such commotions as did give way to any one innovation. I use Mr. Whites *own Argument*, p. 117. *For a man not to Act, not to turn from your Religion, it is enough to have no Reason; but to Act, to prove that your Religion is infallible, or to a Pagan, that it is the true uncorrupted, you ought to have a positive cause.*

¶ 7. I agree with you that the age of Errors, gives them no approach to Truth; and that one of 1000 years is no lesse an Error, then one of but a day old. But you must also agree with me, that 'tis a great prejudice against its being an Error, if a Tenet have with constancy and generality been held so great a space of time. For what subtlety can obscure it from the eyes of the world, that in so long time it should not be discovered? Prove therefore, but do not suppose, our Tenets to be Errors; and as then Age will afford them no patronage, so till then it makes the presumption of truth to be clearly on their side; This being most evident in our case, that Truth cannot be without Age, nor Novelty with Truth. For the assurance you desire that every part of our faith was clearly throughout every age,

you

you may receive it by reflecting that 'tis clearly through the present age, which, because of the forementioned principle, could not be, without its having been so through the last. Now what your eyes shew you in these two Ages, your Judgement (if ye suffer it to sway you, and nothing to sway it) will assure you must have happened in every age, the case being perfectly the same in all.

You think Mr. *Whites* Argument a Sophisme, because a man may take up a new opinion, and think it true, though he be mistaken. But can he think his new opinion, which he takes up, was delivered him by his Forefathers, that is, not new, and not taken up? Till he do this, which is palpable contradiction, let him think his Opinions never so true, his thoughts will bring no prejudice to the Argument, for to be True, and to be of Faith, are two quite different things: This, supposes being delivered, and your opinion is supposed newly taken up, that is not delivered, that is not of Faith, and seen not to be so; now if reason, common sence, and experience tell you that who thinks a thing true, must therefore think it of Faith, when, by

thinking it new, he muſt of neceſſity think it not of Faith, I muſt confeſſe I can make little claim to any of them: For they all three tell me the Argument is clearly and unavoydably convincing.

But Mr. White keeps not to it alone. True, but 'tis when Mr. *White* is doing ſomething elſe then ſhould be done by it. This is an Argument, and an Argument is to prove; would you have him, when his part is to anſwer, and ſhew his Adverſary does not prove, go about to prove himſelf, that is not to anſwer? how unreaſonable is it to except againſt a man for doing his duty? *But if this were univerſally true and evident, he might ſalve all objections by it.* If you will think an objection ſolv'd, when 'tis proved there muſt be an error in it: This indeed will ſolve all objections; But I had thought it had been alſo requiſite to find that error out, for it being againſt the rules of Logick to deny the Concluſion, and admit the Premiſes; he that anſwers ought to ſhew a defect either in the matter or form of the Argument, or yeeld his right to except againſt the Concluſion: Now this principle only ſhews there muſt be a fault in the Argument, and becauſe

Mr.

Mr. *White* endeavours to shew where that fault is, I dare say he expected not a reprehension from the owner of so much both candor and art. *All he says is to evade the Arguments*, and all he should say when he answers, is to shew them unconcluding, *and onely keep to this, that no age did admit any new point* de facto; *which way you confess sufficient to keep our hold, if satisfactorily done*, if this be sufficient, Mr. *White* should deserve rather your thanks then censure, if he have condescended to the waywardness of those who desire more.

And I must intreat you, since every body ought to be satisfied of their innocence, who are not satisfactorily proved guilty, to remember the obligation lyes upon you to bring proof, and that satisfactory, not to prejudice or passion, but to that great Judge, who is justice it self, that some age has actually admitted Errors, as you value the consequence of the sentence which belongs to those, who either introduce, or continue Schism upon pretence of Errors there, where, for ought they know are none; for did they know it, they might make others know

it also, that is, prove it; *but then we must not pretend to Infallibility*, I think no body does pretend, that who has proved no Errors have come in, has proved no Errors can come in; we endeavour to prove this too, when we pretend to prove infallibility. *For you onely prove seemingly the possession*, I do not know who does so much as seem to go about the proving of that which is apparent in it self beyond the evidence of proof: That *Luther* was a Member of the Catholick Church, till he set himself to oppose it, and that till he changed his profession, he professed what the Church then did, and hath ever since maintained, (and what I instance onely in *Luther*, I understand of all introducers of Novelty that ever deserted the Church) are things beyond either the necessity, or rather power of proof, for I am yet to learn in what Mood and Figure that Syllogism must be, which must prove the Sun shines at noon.

I see the largeness of your territories is that wherein your chief strength lies. 'Tis indeed universality which renders nature true and constant to her self, whereas in a particular,

cular she may be defective; one man may be born lame, or blind, but not all. That corruption would have bred a combustion, which must have been known, you acknowledg has some appearance of reason, though nothing else has: Thanks be to God at least for so much, which if you would please fairly to own, and make a step to a further progress, without diminishing it into appearance of reason, when I must take the liberty to think, nothing appears reason you can oppose against it, you were in a hopeful way to your satisfaction; but not to admit a truth, seen to be so, is a weakness, which destroys all possibility either of advance in your self, or success in the pains which are taken for you; for what more can be done; then to deliver a truth with that plainness that no reason can be found out to encounter it? *But quotations are necessary to make up* Mr. Whites *proofs*; if it were so, eternal happiness might well deserve a little labour; but must Authors be quoted to shew, that, if the corruption be taken notice of, it could not come in unawares, and if not unawares then openly; and this either by reason, which

is

is to change the natures of truth and falſhood, or force which to overcome the extent of the Church, and continue ſo many ages as is neceſſary to the plantation of Errors of this importance, nature, without looking into Books, tells us the impoſſibility of.

The Argument you make in the laſt place, I beſeech you make againſt your ſelf, and ſince 'tis in a matter of no leſſe concern then eternal either happineſs or miſery, make it faithfully. Conſider that if, not to act, no reaſon is requiſite, to act there muſt be reaſon; you have acted, and though not actually begun a ſeparation, yet actually follow, and adhere to thoſe who did begin it, and do continue it. This action in a caſe of ſuch importance as Schiſm, requires ſuch reaſon as is fit for ſalvation to depend on. Examine therefore your reaſons, but ſeverely, and ſo as your Conſcience be willing and ſecure to own them at that Judgment where the ſentence is eternity, and if you find them to have neer the force of thoſe of ours, which you ſay have no force, I ſhall think either your judgment ſtrangely byaſſed, or mine ſtrangely blind.

This

This to you, but to a Pagan I acknowledg he is not to be put upon the proof; you may if you please, for your experience, reflect what your self would say to one, and see whether you can say any thing stronger to him, then we do to you; if your thoughts be faithful to you, I doubt, what you deny reason against your self, must either be reason against him, or you will have much ado to keep your Arguments from being unreasonable. I have had some proof of this, in a Divine of yours, famous, and I think deservedly, as any of your side; whose discourse upon this Theam makes experience joyn with my reason to strengthen the confidence I have of the truth of what I say.

¶ 8. *I cannot see, how you that take away the distinction of Fundamental, and a non-Fundamental in points of faith, can evade that of the Quartadecimans proving the chief part of Christians to have been mistaken in this Traditional way, holding by it contradictions, while each part pretends this title, and so shews it, not an infallible way, to say it was a small point received in some Churches. In answer, to the gradual receiving of the Cannon, you confess one Province may have sufficient evi-*

dence

dence of that one truth, which from it must be spread over the rest of the Church.

I think those things which I have written prove not only your way not only fallible, but false in many points. Several other things I have observed in Mr. White *which do not satisfie me; but because I want those Authors necessary to make my Objections cleer, I chuse rather to be silent in them, then not to speak to purpose.*

Had I time to write these over again, I might make what I say cleerer, but I doubt not but your ingenuity will discerne my meaning, and according to promise grant me a candid answer, which I shall gratefully embrace, and if convincing, as readily acknowledge.

In the mean while I rest, Yours to serve you in what I may.

¶ 8. As for your distinction of fundamental and not fundamental in points of faith, the words possibly may be taken in such a sence that it may be tolerable; but if by *fundamental* you mean necessary, this being plainly a relative word, it ought to be expressed to whom they are necessary, if you say to mankind, 'tis evident no point is not-fundamental, since

since so God would have taught us what is unnecessary, that is, done a needless action; if to a single man, then they can never be assigned, since they vary according to the several exigencies of several persons.

The instance of the *Quartadecimans*, being, I conceive, fully answered by Mr. *White* p. 44. I have no more to do, after I have referred you thither, where you will find the point it self was no subject of Tradition, but a practise, which according to the different circumstances of different places, was by the wisdom of the Apostles, who saw what was convenient for the time and place they lived in, practised differently, and afterwards, by the wisdom of the Church, those circumstances ceasing, reduced to an Uniformity.

For the rest, I hope, what I have written, will satisfie you, that neither falsity, nor fallibility of Mr. *Whites* way appears in your Exceptions. It had been easie and perhaps necessary, had the piece been intended for more then your self, to have woven it something closer; but a sight that pierces so far into the bracks of an Argument, can be no less sharp in discovering

vering its faſtneſs; and I think your eye too ſtrong to need ſpectacles or glaſſes, or whatever helps are invented for weaker Organs. I am onely to make Apologie for the delay of this Reply, occaſioned by a little buſineſs, and a great deal of ſickneſs, and to profeſs, that if this Anſwer be not ſuch a one as you deſire, 'tis the miſ-fortune of many a good cauſe, to ſuffer by the badneſs of its Advocates.

Your very Humble Servant

J. B.

FINIS.